Minutes of the Proceedings

OF THE

TWENTY-FIFTH CONVENTION

OF THE

Ev. Luth. Jt. Synod of Ohio

AND OTHER STATES,

HELD IN THE

Ev. Lutheran St. James Congregation at Wheeling, W. Va.

FROM SEPTEMBER 8 TO 15, 1881.

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
PRINTED AT THE LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN.
(J. L. Trauger, Agent.)
1881.

MINUTES

OF THE

TWENTY-FIFTH CONVENTION.

The Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Ohio and other States met in extra session, in accordance with an announcement made in our Church papers by the President, Rev. Prof. M. Loy, at Wheeling, W. Va., in the Ev. Luth. St. James congregation, Rev. A. W. Werder, pastor, on the 8th of September, 1881, at 8 A. M., and was opened by the President according to the order of our German Liturgy.

Pastor H. A. Becker handed in his resignation as English Recording Secretary on account of his impaired health, and Pastor A. Pflueger was elected to that office.

Twelve sessions were held, two of which were night sessions. The time fixed upon for the sessions was from 8 to 11 A. M. and from 2 to 5 P. M. Pastor H. A. Schmidt was elected Chaplain by whom the sessions were opened with liturgical services. All the sessions—with the exception of the last, which was closed by the Chaplain—were closed by praying the Lord's Prayer in concert or by singing the Apostolic Benediction.

During several of the final sessions Rev. Prof. Mees officiated as German Secretary pro tem, on account of the severe illness of the regular Secretary, Pastor C. Huebner.

The following pastors and lay delegates were present at the organization of the meeting, or appeared in the course of the proceedings:

I.—OF THE NORTHERN DISTRICT.

Pastors.	Lay Delegates.	Pastors.	Lay Delegates.
J. Bauch		H. Lang	
E. A. Boehme		C. Lembke	
E. A. Born		W. C. Lembke	
C. Buechler		P. H. Mueller	
C. Clessler		S. Poppen	C. Schwarzmann.
G. Cronenwett	H. Meyer	G. F. Reitz	

L. Dammann		E. H. Scheips	
G. Dillmann		J. Schmierer	
J. C. Eirich		J. A. Schulze	
F. Eppling		J. J. Sutter	
S. Hunziker		A. E. Ulrich	
J. Krieger		A. B. Weber	
J. Kucher	W. Jacobs	F. N. Wolf	H. W. Kuttelbrink.

II.—OF THE WESTERN DISTRICT.

Pastors.	Lay Delegates.	Pastors.	Lay Delegates.
C. H. Althoff	C. Robert	C. H. Mayer	J. Deininger.
F. W. Althoff		A. Michaelis	
G. Bachmann		W. Niebuhr	
W. Bauermeister		C. J. Oehlschlaeger	John Jung.
C. J. Benzin		O. Priwer	
J. Dingeldey		C. G. Reichert	
G. Doepken		Prof. E. Schmid	
A. J. Feger		Ph. Schmidt	
W. L. Fischer		W. Schmidt	
F. W. Franke		P. G. Schmogrow	
E. Gerfen		H. J. Schuh	J. H. Spielmann.
R. Graetz		C. A. Schulze	
H. Henkel		W. J. Schroyer	
C. E. Herbst		J. Siermanns	
G. R. Herbst		Prof. F. W. Stellhorn.	
From R. Herbst's cong.	J. Gruebler	G. H. Trebel	
C. F. Huebner		J. D. Warns	
Th. H. Jaeger		F. Wendt	
J. M. Koepplin		H. Wickemeyer	
G. Loewenstein		F. C. Wiechers	
W. Luedeman		G. Wolf	H. F. Schnell.
Prof. Theo. Mees		F. Zagel	

III.—OF THE EASTERN DISTRICT.

Pastors.	Lay Delegates.	Pastors.	Lay Delegates.
F. C. Becker	Ph. Bock	G. F. H. Meiser	
F. H. Besel		C. F. Mayer	
P. Brand	W Markensen	E. Pfeiffer	
J. L. Braun		P. Raether	
C. F. W. Brecht	Peter Schneider	P. M. Reidenbach	
W. L. Busch		H. L. Schenck	
J. G. Butz		From Schiedt's cong.	George Schodde.
E. Cronenwett	J. Keck	B. F. Schillinger	
L. A. Detzer		S. Schillinger	G. W. Lose.
P. G. Doepken		C. Schmidt	
Theo. P. Ebert		H. A. Schmidt	
P. Engers	Nic. Wendler	Prof. G. H. Schodde	
E. L. T. Engers		J. Stumpf	
C. Engelder		K. Walz	Peter Prager.
A. H. Feldmann	H. Stockert	A. W. Werder	W. Steinmann.
J. F. Gerkensmeyer		F. Wilhelm	Jos. Filgers.
J. Hoerr		J. Wilhelm	H. Schaper.
W. L. Kropp	Martin Wahl	Otto v. Zech	
M. F. Lauffer			

IV.—OF THE ENGLISH DISTRICT.

Pastors.	Lay Delegates.	Pastors.	Lay Delegates.
S. Baechler	J. Binkley	J. O. Miller	D. Snapp, jr.
J. Beck		O. S. Oglesby	
H. A. Becker	J. Klein	A. Pflueger	
A. Birch		H. J. Reimann	Ph. Whonsettler.
W. A. Bowman		H. L. Ridenour	
W. H. Brown	M. L. Baum	Prof. C. H. L. Schuette	
C. H. Eckhardt		D. Simon	J. L. Trauger.
M. H. Hockmann		P. S. Swinehart	Sam. A. Hahn.
Prof. M. Loy		M. Walter	
L. F. Meyer	G. Neiswender	G. Weber	

V.—OF THE CONCORDIA DISTRICT.

Pastors.	Lay Delegates.	Pastors.	Lay Delegates.
L. H. Burry		J. A. Lautenschlæger	
G. T. Cooperrider		W. Sibert	J. Dascher.
From A. Hahn's cong.	J. L. Hahn	E. G. Tressel	F. Stutz.
F. Kuegele	J. Colner	E. L. S. Tressel	G. F. Dannettel.

J. L. Fehr, teacher at Woodville, O., was also present.

The following Pastors were absent:

I.—OF THE NORTHERN DISTRICT.

C. Adam,	J. Dornbirer,	E. Kornbaum,	G. Sutter,
C. H. Althoff,	C. Francke,	C. Lilje,	C. Volz,
H. F. Belser,	W. F. Helle,	H. W. Mohrhoff,	H. Willert,
W. F. Deiss,	A. Hordorf,	C. Raths,	
J. Doerfler,	J. M. Johanssen,	C. Schlenker,	

II.—OF THE WESTERN DISTRICT.

H. Borchers,	H. Freese,	J. M. Meissner,	J. G. Theiss,
G. E. Buchholz,	F. A. Groth,	Ph. A. Peter,	R. Weise.
E. F. A. Dittmer,	R. Herbst,	J. C. Schulze,	
A. Eberbach,	E. Mahlberg,	L. Serr,	

III.—OF THE EASTERN DISTRICT.

J. Humberger, G. Kranz, D. M. Martens, F. Schiedt, L. Vogelsang.

IV.—OF THE ENGLISH DISTRICT.

C. H. Albrecht,	H. J. G. Bartholomew,	G. A. Harter,	W. A. Weisman,
A. S. Bartholomew,	G. Baughman,	J. O. Hoffman,	G. Yung.

V.—OF THE CONCORDIA DISTRICT.

A. A. Hahn, J. E. Senecker.

Altogether there were 132 pastors, 36 lay delegates and two congregational school teachers present at this meeting of synod.

After the President had stated that, according to the order of our synod, the credentials of the lay delegates should be signed by the pastor and secretary of their respective congregations, he proceeded to read the following

PRESIDENT'S REPORT.

Dearly Beloved Brethren in Christ!

Already at our last regular synod in Dayton, it appeared that no small dangers were threatening our Synodical Conference. Since that time the prospects have not become better. The pleasant relation in which, for ten years, we stood with other Ev. Lutheran synods, has been disturbed in such a manner that many brethren considered an extraordinary meeting of our synod necessary, and, in accordance with their express wish, this extra session has been convoked.

Synod had already resolved, indeed, to hold a general pastoral conference for the purpose of discussing the existing differences in the doctrine of predestination. Many brethren, however, in view of the procedure of the Missouri Synod, considered it absolutely necessary for our synod to convene in order to be enabled to take decisive action. Inasmuch as I did not consider myself authorized to substitute this meeting for the conference already appointed, the day after the opening of conference was chosen for the session of synod. It is now for synod to decide whether the conference which was begun yesterday shall be continued in such a manner that the morning session be used for the purpose of discussing the doctrine, and that synod hold its sessions in the afternoon, or whether the doctrinal discussion be taken up by synod itself and continued as the concern of synod.

At our session last autumn we did not suppose that our synod would be obliged so soon to give its decision on the question of election. We are not wont to act so hastily in such important matters. I have no doubt that most, if not all all the members of our synod would be willing, if circumstances permitted it, in patience and love, to discuss the disputed points for years, in the hope, by God's grace, finally to effect unity of doctrine among us. Our relations, however, are of such a nature as to compel us, I think, to take a clear and decided position in the burning question. This would in no wise hinder us from patiently bearing with those of different opinion among us so far as they do not feel themselves constrained to condemn our doctrine, and afterwards discussing with them the points of difference in brotherly love.

What in my estimation urges us to a decision is the action of the Missouri Synod in the present controversy. She treats the difference, if not in and of itself, yet in view of the accusations which among others members of our synod also find themselves constrained to raise against her as a point of separation between churches, and therefore feels herself called upon to dis-

continue church-fellowship with her opponents. This is important for us in a twofold aspect. In the first place, we must decide whether we must refuse or welcome into our midst as brethren such pastors and congregations as can no longer remain in that synod and apply for admission among us. In the second place we must decide in what relation we stand to that body after she has instructed her delegates to the Synodical Conference not to sit and confer with those who have raised against her the accusation of Calvanizing tendencies.

As regards the first point, the Missouri Synod, as is well known, took occasion to lay down a confession with reference to the burning question, because in her own midst opposition arose against the doctrine of predestination, as set forth in her publications. This confession is of such import as to make it impossible for some members of the synod conscientiously to accept it. Some have already withdrawn from the synod because of her departure from the old Lutheran doctrine, and others will in all probability be yet constrained to take this step. These, however, occupy the same doctrinal position which they occupied for years, and simply refuse to subscribe to a doctrine in contradiction with their old faith. Hitherto we have cherished fraternal communion with them. Inasmuch as they can no longer remain in the Missouri Synod, some of them come to us. It seems to me that we cannot avoid declaring whether we also must refuse to fellowship with them in the future, on account of their refusal to abandon the doctrine they have hitherto confessed and to accept the new confession of Missouri. Though it is greatly to be regretted that we must so soon come to a decision in the question, it is certain, I think, that under the circumstances a decision must be given.

The matter referred to in the second point likewise urges us to give such a decision. It might appear to some, indeed, as though the instructions given to the delegates of the Missouri Synod did not concern us as a synod, and as though this would in no wise hinder us from proceeding as usual without taking sides in the present doctrinal controversy. This, however, is not the case. For among those with whom the delegates of Missouri are not to sit and confer are, as we have it from reliable sources, also some members of our synod, and among them those who have been chosen as delegates to the Synodical Conference. The fact, therefore, that the Missouri Synod will not confer with these constrains us in a twofold manner as a synod to declare our position in the controversy. On the one hand the question arises whether we can and will sit and confer with those with whom Missouri, according to her own declaration, can not. In this way we are compelled either to go with Missouri and thus to refuse fellowship with our members who will no longer recognize Missouri as brethren, or to separate from Missouri by sitting or conferring with these as formerly and so partaking in the eyes of that synod of their supposed sin. The question thus forced upon us cannot possibly be decided without taking a firm position in the present controversy. Neither ought we to ignore the fact that our synod has already chosen those as delegates to the Synodical Conference whom Missouri will no longer acknowledge as brethren. If we insist on

our right to elect our delegates ourselves without permitting the Missouri Synod to dictate anything to us in this regard, she will thereby cease to recognize our synod, inasmuch as our delegates will not be recognized. The repulsion of our delegates would be a repulsion of the synod itself, inasmuch as the former were elected after their position in the controversy and the declaration of Missouri over against them were generally known. Furthermore, our delegates will certainly not be willing to submit to an investigation on the part of the Synodical Conference concerning their orthodoxy, inasmuch as this is not the business of that body, but their own synod. If their own synod is satisfied with their doctrinal position, the Synodical Conference has not to deal with the delegated persons, if their orthodoxy is questioned, but with their synod. It seems to me, therefore, simply impossible under existing circumstances to decide the practical question of our relation to the Synodical Conference, without deciding at the same time which position we occupy in the controversy. The procedure of the Missouri Synod compels us to fix our position in the burning question as decidedly as she has done.

I beg leave, therefore, to recommend to this body that in a few sentences our position in this controversy will be distinctly set forth. The full and complete theses presented before the pastoral conference might then be thoroughly discussed without compelling us to hasten to conclude the matter in this session. While these circumstances are urging us to occupy a decided position in the controversy, we are in no wise compelled to conclude the discussion now already in all its points. I trust that the synod will continue to hold the old doctrine of the Lutheran Church as it has been confessed by our fathers at all times, without permitting itself to be led astray by any innovations whatever, and as regards the difficulties in various points, we may consider and discuss them at some more opportune time.

It was not an easy matter to be an editor since our last meeting, in view of the understanding which many brethren had in regard to what was required of the editors of our church papers respecting the doctrine of predestination. Since, as I hope, synod will at this meeting declare its position respecting the question in controversy, the difficulty now confronting us in this matter will thereby be removed. In thinking about this matter, however, something else forced itself upon me, which I cannot refrain from mentioning. Should not our synod, especially under the circumstances which now obtain, have something more than the small semi-monthly *Kirchenzeitung*, in order to disseminate and defend our doctrine and practice and, in general, to make her influence felt through the medium of the German language? I think she should. It seems to me that a German theological periodical of our own has now become a necessity. I desire, therefore, earnestly to recommend to synod that it take into consideration at this meeting the establishment of such a periodical to appear monthly, commencing say on 1st of January, 1882. As is known, an English theological periodical has made its appearance this year within our synod through private means. Should synod deem it proper to accept said periodical as

her property, the same is at her disposal. In case it should seem good to synod to increase her periodicals, arrangements would of course have to be made to have them edited, in connection with which I take the liberty to suggest the question, whether the labor, so far as it devolves upon the Faculty at Columbus, might not be better divided. Since changes have occurred since our last meeting, which at any rate render new appointments for the editing of our church papers necessary, it would at all events be desirable to consider said question.

In respect to our educational institutions the Board of Directors will present several points which necessarily require our attention at this meeting. Of these I desire especially to emphasize the one containing the proposal to appoint an agent whose duty it shall be to encourage talented young men to study in our institutions, to awaken a more active participation in their support in our congregations, to aid in circulating our periodicals, and in general to further our synodical work. It is no doubt clear to all that we must disregard all proposals to unite with others in the Synodical Conference in carrying on our educational work. All the more should we consider it our duty so to arrange and support our institutions that they may meet all our wants. Whether it will still be necesary, now that the matter of educating parochial school teachers has been attended to through the private undertaking of the brethren in and near Woodville, to make further arrangements respecting the object in view, synod will decide.

It is not necessary, brethren, that I should specially call attention to the great importance of the present meeting. It is doubtful whether there is one among us who has not felt this and who did not come here with the conviction that our transactions will be of great consequence to the Church in this country and especially to our synod. God grant that we may all most earnestly enter into the service of the recognized truth of the Gospel, and that at the same time we may also entertain the sincere purpose, as much as lieth in us, to live peaceably with all men. "Wherefore, seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith." And may the God of peace be with us all. Amen.

M. LOY.

WHEELING, W. VA., *September 8th*, 1881.

The President then proceeded to appoint the following committees:

I. *On President's Report:* Pastors G. F. H. Meiser, H. Lang, H. J. Schuh, E. L. S. Tressel and Prof. C. H. L. Schuette, and delegates J. H. Spielmann and F. Stutz.

II. *On Excuses:* Pastors G. Cronenwett, C. F. W. Brecht and G. Loewenstein, and delegates W. Jacobs and J. Binkley.

III. *On Missions and Applications:* Pastors G. Doepken, H. A. Becker and H. Henkel, and delegates Ch. Robert and J. Keck.

Hereupon the committee, appointed on the day previous to draw up and lay before synod several short theses respecting the main points in the present controversy, handed in their report. After the four theses, drawn up by the committee, had been read, synod resolved to have the same printed both in English and German, but immediately to proceed with the discussion of the first Thesis. The doctrinal discussion which continued uninterruptedly during six sessions of synod, and which, in spite of the disagreement that immediately manifested itself, aimed in a brotherly way at convincing the opposing brethren, was confined, strictly speaking, to the first and second of the four theses, but really embraced the whole of the controverted question, and was thus well suited to enable all the members of synod to get into the clear respecting the doctrine of election.

DOCTRINAL DISCUSSION

ON

Predestination or Election.

The four theses laid before synod for discussion read as follows:

OUR CONFESSION CONCERNING ELECTION.

1. If by election we understand, as is done by the Formula of Concord, the entire "purpose, counsel, will, and ordination of God pertaining to our redemption, vocation, justification, and salvation," we believe, teach, and confess that election is *the cause* of our salvation and of everything that in any way pertains to it, therefore, also of our redemption and vocation, of our faith and perseverance in faith. Thus understood, election precedes faith as the cause precedes its effect.

2. But if by election, as the dogmaticians generally do, we understand *merely this*, that from eternity God elected and infallibly ordained to salvation certain individuals in preference to others, and this according to the universal way of salvation, we believe, teach, and confess that election took place *in view of Christ's merit apprehended by faith*, or, more briefly stated but with the same sense, *in view of faith*. According to this understanding faith precedes election in the mind of God, as *the rule*, according to which one selects, precedes the *election* itself, and thus election, properly speaking, is not the cause of faith.

3. The mystery in election consists *not* in this, that we do not with certainty know from the Word of God according to what rule God proceeded in the selection of persons, but in this: (*a*) That no one except God *knows* who belongs to the elect; (*b*) That we creatures are unable to fathom and comprehend the wonderful guidance and dispensations of the grace of God towards individuals as well as whole nations.

4. The *certainty* of the individual that *he* belongs to the elect is, before his hour of death, a *conditional* or *regulated* (geordnete) certainty, that is, bound to a certain condition or order; under this condition and in this order, however, it is also infallible.

After synod had resolved to take up the first of these theses for discussion, a member of the committee, in answer to a certain question, gave the following explanation, in order to set forth the reasons which guided the committee in drawing up the theses and especially the first. It is evident from the first and second theses that the committee acknowledges the fact that in the Lutheran Church election has always been spoken of in different senses, and that it is also allowable thus to speak. But inasmuch as the sense in which it is spoken of at any time is of uncommon importance so far as the inferences to be drawn are concerned, the committee considered it right to set this forth in the outset and expressly to state it in the theses, since there is a factor, namely faith, whose application is of the greatest significance in the present controversy, and whose position varies according to the sense in which the word election is used. Something similar to this is the case in sanctification. Like election, sanctification can be spoken of in a wider or a narrower sense. If we speak of sanctification in the wider sense, the entire work

of the Holy Ghost belongs to it, and therefore all that also which precedes and follows sanctification in the narrow sense as a work of the Holy Ghost. Of course, sanctification in the narrow sense is then included; but the relation of faith to sanctification will certainly be entirely different when the latter is used in the wider than when it is used in the narrower sense. If, for example, I understand sanctification in the *wider sense* as the entire work of the Holy Spirit, *it is then the cause of faith*, whilst *faith is the cause of sanctification* in the *narrow* sense, which flows from faith as its source. It is therefore very important that we determine in which sense a thing is spoken of, whether in the wider or the narrower.

It seems that those who now depart from the doctrine of the fathers do not properly consider this. That it has been customary to speak of election in different senses can not be denied. If by election I understand only this, that God from eternity chose a certain number of persons and ordained them infallibly to salvation by the way of faith, then this is election in the *narrowest* sense. If we add to this selection of distinct persons, all the eternal decrees of God respecting the attainment of salvation, the so-called *ordinatio mediorum salutis* (Hutter) of which the first is that God determined to send His Son to redeem the whole human race, then we have election in the widest sense. If, however, we only add one decree, namely this one, that whoever believeth shall be saved, then I use the term election in the *wider* sense. That this threefold distinction is not an invention of the speaker or his colleagues is evident from the following passage from J. F. Koenig's (1619-64) Theol. posit. p. 113: "Predestination is derived from the preposition *prae* (before) and the verb destino (determine); for it is an eternal decree preceding all time. This word is used either *improperly* and *indefinitely*, so that it includes the appointment to death as well as to life, which signification, although it is used by several of the fathers, is very properly rejected by us, because it is not in accord with the Holy Scriptures; or it is used properly and definitely, so that according to the language of Scripture it signifies only the appointment to life. In its good sense this word is used either in the wider signification, as is the case in the Formula of Concord, Art. XI. Solida Declaratio, p. 802, Mueller's edition; or in the *narrower* sense, so that it means the decree respecting the

salvation of the believers, *connected with the* PURPOSE *and* FORESIGHT *of God*, and in this sense our writers are to be understood who say that faith belongs to election; or in the strictest sense signifying the mere *predetermination*, in as far as this differs from the *purpose* and *foresight*, in which sense election *does not include* faith, but presupposes it, since it took place in view of faith, which faith according to the order or succession of conceptions precedes election. The second sense is the most common." Thus Koenig distinguishes a three-fold use of the word election in the Lutheran Church; namely a wider, of which he says that it is the sense in which the Book of Concord speaks of election; a middle sense, namely the appointment of the believers alone unto salvation, which however is connected with the purpose and foresight of God; and finally a strictest sense signifying the mere predetermination, so far as it is distinct from the purpose and foreknowledge, which sense it does not include, but presupposes faith. Of the middle sense he affirms that it is the one commonly used among us. The old teachers in our church made use of the so-called syllogism of predestination. Major: He that believeth unto the end shall be saved; minor: God foresaw that they, Peter, Paul, Luther, would believe unto the end; conclusion: therefore Peter, Paul, Luther, etc., shall infallibly be saved. This last decree, then, taken by itself, would be election in the strictest sense. Koenig is not the only one who makes this distinction in the use of the word election. Quenstedt (1617–88) agrees with this conception almost verbatim as also does Hollaz (1648–1713). Baier, whose dogmatic theology is universally recognized as orthodox and is well known among us, distinguishes a two-fold sense, a wider and a stricter sense, at the same time observing that the wider is the one used in the Formula of Concord. He says in the passage concerning predestination, § 2: "The words predestination and election sometimes signify that decree of God which has reference to the whole work respecting the salvation of men, and sometimes especially the decree infallibly to save certain persons who in a certain respect (sub certa ratione) were known to the divine foreknowledge. The first of these significations is the wider, through which, so to speak, the whole process of God in the work of salvation which should take place in time, is designated as already decreed from eternity. And taken in this sense it can be said that predestination, or

the eternal election of God, works the salvation of the children of God and directs everything which belongs thereto. See Formula of Concord, Art. XI., No. 4. (Mueller, p. 554.) Certain grades or degrees are also enumerated in which election or predestination consists. See Formula of Concord, Sol. Decl., Art. XI." (Mueller, 707 sq.)

A motion was hereupon adopted to consider 1. Whether the thesis, as it reads, is true; and 2. To consider it in the light of history and the confessions.

After closer consideration it became evident that no objection could be made against the truth of the thesis as it reads; and the discussion accordingly turned upon its historical and confessional character.

Here it was distinctly denied by one of the opponents that the election designated in the thesis was the election of the Scriptures and the confessions. It was claimed that it could not be shown that the Scriptures anywhere taught such an election, or so much as allowed a distinction between election in the wider and in the narrower sense. There is a universal will of salvation and council of God which extends over all men. This is expressed in many passages of Scripture, but nowhere does the Word of God call this universal will of salvation, or the establishment of the plan of salvation for all, *election*. Election according to the Scriptures embraces only the *elect* whom God desires to bring to salvation on the way of faith. In order to speak profitably of the election of grace it is of course necessary to take into consideration also the whole counsel, purpose, etc., of God, as the confession says; but when it is desired to define election as a conception, this universal plan of salvation does not belong to the definition proper, as this embraces only the elect.

Against this it was remarked: The fact is that it has ever been customary in the church to speak of election in different senses. If one desires therefore to give an explanation of the election of grace, it becomes necessary to mention in what sense one desires the word to be understood. The authors of the thesis call election, in the strictest sense, the decree of God that these and these persons shall infallibly be saved, and that on the way of faith. When one speaks of election in the wider sense the following decree must be added; He that believeth unto the end shall be saved. If these two decrees be taken together then

we have election in the wider sense. If we also take in the decree of redemption, vocation, etc., we then speak of election in the widest sense. In this way the conception of election in the strictest sense is in no wise excluded but is necessarily included. The example of the term sanctification in the wider and stricter sense, as it has previously been elucidated, should certainly set this matter clearly before our minds. So one could also speak of Prussia in the stricter sense and would thereby designate the provinces of East and West Prussia. But one could also speak of Prussia in the wider sense, in which that designated by the term in its narrower sense would necessarily be included. This is not to be forgotten in explaining the word election. We have here before us in the first two theses the two most common conceptions of the term election, namely first, the one which the Formula of Concord uses, and secondly, the one used by the dogmaticians. Accordingly as the word is understood thus or otherwise, so must the relation which faith sustains to it, be different according to the sense in which it is taken. This is made prominent, because the controversy specially hinges thereon. It has already been remarked that this different manner of speaking must be specially borne in mind. Therefore the fathers constantly made this distinction prominent. Besides the ones already mentioned we might refer to Hunnius, Lucas Osiander the younger, and others. Lucas Osiander, in his *Enchiridion Controversiarum*, published in 1614, after insisting that the definition of election is not to be conceived according to the arbitrary ideas of our understanding, but according to the Scriptures, writes thus: "In order that we may guard against this we must first learn what the Scriptures call election and what belongs thereto. But this is treated of with admirable brevity and precision in the Formula of Concord." And then follow §§ 13–24 of the XI. Art. with the omission of § 23. Osiander accordingly finds in those paragraphs the *definition* of election in the sense of the Formula of Concord. Hutter (1563–1616) teaches in accord with the Formula of Concord two chief parts of election, namely the ordinatio mediorum, the eternal establishment of the plan of salvation, and the selection of definite individual persons to the infallible attainment of salvation. That at the time when the Formula of Concord was written it was customary to speak of election in the widest sense, can easily be proven. In the pas-

sage from Luther's introduction to the Epistle to the Romans, so often referred to, he says: "In the 9th, 10th, and 11th chapters he (Paul) teaches concerning the eternal election of God, from which it originally flows, who *shall* and who *shall not* believe, who can and who can not be rid of sins; so that our becoming pious is taken entirely out of our hands and placed in God's hand alone." Does Luther here speak of election in the stricter or in the widest sense? Should Luther really have meant that the act of God, whereby He, out of the mass of persons in all respects alike, out of His grace and mercy, for the sake of the merits of Christ secured for all men, selected certain individual persons to the infallible attainment of salvation, is the proper and final cause why one man can believe and be rid of sin and why another can not believe nor be rid of sin? Then Luther would be the grossest Calvinist imaginable. Or can we be satisfied with saying: the first half of the sentence I understand and can easily apply to election in the strict sense, but the second half I do not understand and can not make use of it in election in this sense!? This will never do, since the second half of the sentence is just as clear as the first, and vice versa. But even if we take the first half to mean election in the strict sense, can it really be said, and do the opponents wish to say, that the selection of individual persons is the last or FINAL *source* of their faith, that out of this selection of individual persons it ORIGINALLY flows, that this is the proper and final cause why the elect believe? I think no Lutheran can and will say this who knows that the final cause is the eternal good will of God for the salvation of men. So the oldest fathers understood these words of Luther and explain them too as referring to election in the widest sense, e. g. Olearius, Gerhard, Hollaz. Understood in this sense the passage is clear and true. For out of the eternal establishment of the universal plan of salvation, the first and chief part of election in the widest sense, it evidently does primarily flow who shall believe and who not, who can be rid of sin and who not. God has provided a certain way unto salvation. Whoever will not suffer himself to be led on this way by the Holy Spirit, but wantonly and stubbornly debars the Holy Spirit from leading him upon this regular way, so that He *cannot* perform His work in him, that person *shall* not believe and *cannot* have the forgiveness of sins. For upon such an one God

would have to force faith and the forgiveness of sins. But God will not do that. But whoever will suffer himself to be brought on this way by the grace of God, he *shall* believe and *can* have the forgiveness of sins.

In the same manner Luther speaks of election in the widest sense, including in the same as its chief part the eternal appointment of the universal way of salvation, in his Preface to the Epistle to the Ephesians. There he says: "In this Epistle St. Paul, in the first place, teaches what the Gospel is, how that it alone was ordained of God in eternity and merited and sent forth by Christ, that all who believe the same should be righteous, pious, saved, and free from the law, sin, and death. This he does throughout the first three chapters." Here, in one of the chief portions of Scripture concerning predestination, Luther finds the eternal foreordination of the Gospel taught, or the eternal decree that all who believe the Gospel, shall be justified and saved. He even says that the Gospel *alone* was eternally ordained of God. To him the eternal ordination of the Gospel is evidently the chief part of election, upon which the selection of individuals depends as upon its foundation and rule. Chemnitz too takes election in its widest sense, as can be most convincingly proved from different parts of his works, which have all been frequently mentioned in this controversy.

Against this one of the brethren on the opposite side remarked, that the quotation cited from Luther's Preface to Romans was always torn from its connection and on that account misunderstood; for Luther's real purpose in these words is to show that our salvation and all that belongs to it, is taken entirely out of our hands and rests in the hand of God. But in connection with this Luther speaks of election in its proper and not of an election in its widest sense. Besides, if it is there said, "who *shall* believe or who *not*," this "*shall*" is not to be pressed until Luther is made a horrible Calvinist. With Luther *shall* means nothing more than *will*, and simply stands for the future. This is evident from many passages of Luther's translation of the Scriptures. For example, Gen. 3, 15, he translates "it *shall* bruise thy head," whereas in the Hebrew original, and in the Greek Septuagint, the simple future is used. The same is the case in Gen. 18, 18: "Seeing that Abraham *shall* surely become a great and mighty nation," etc., which is also by no means the

imperative, but simply the future. In addition to other passages, 2 Sam. 7, 12–16, may also be compared, where, in the different passages, *shall* is to be taken in the sense of *will*.

Another of the opponents remarked: That the brethren on the other side include election in its narrow sense, in election in the wider sense, is known. Yet it often seems as though, when speaking of election in the wider sense, more persons were meant and included; at least the expressions of the Pastoral Conference essayist leave the impression as though there were a difference in this respect between the authors of the two sets of theses. Now it is true, that the fathers have spoken of election in different senses. But why burden ourselves and our congregations with these different forms of expression? Let us abide by the Scriptures and the Confessions, and use those terms and speak of these things as the Scriptures and the Confessions do; then we will understand one another and come to the right decision on safe ground.

Against these arguments of the opponents, it was first answered in regard to the attempt made to explain that quotation from Luther's Preface to Romans, that it might remain undecided for the present whether it has been proven that *shall* is to be taken here in the sense of *will*. But how is the second expression, "*can* have, or *cannot* have, the forgiveness of sins," to be brought in harmony with election in its narrowest sense? The contradiction is the same here, and has not been cleared up in the least by that explanation given. Then it was further declared with reference to the argument in general, that it was a mistaken one. It is possible that, according to Luther's mode of expression, *shall* may have been used here and there instead of *will*. But that it must be so understood in the quotation mentioned, the speaker has not in the least proved. He has not even proved that Luther ever used *shall* for *will*. He has entirely overlooked the fact, that the Hebrew as well as the Greek future, is very frequently used imperatively, and more emphatically besides, than the imperative or form of command; and that in Hebrew the imperfect or future form, as a rule, is the same as the passive. And that is decidedly the case in all those passages brought up by him in proof of his opinion. When, for example, God says: "It *shall* bruise thy head," that is indeed God's order and *will*, and not simply the future. "And thou

wilt bruise his heel" Luther therefore translates with his fine understanding of God's words, because the latter is not in the same sense as the former, God's counsel and purpose. Luther very well knew why he in one case renders the future tense by *shall* and in another by *will*. But that quotation taken from Luther's Preface to Romans, by no means treats of election in the narrow sense, and every attempt to prove this must fail. However, when we understand that quotation as treating of election in its widest sense, it is by no means thereby said, that we then take our salvation out of God's hand and put it into our own. It must, although superfluous, be said again, that in the conception of election in its widest sense, we always include the narrow sense, so that in the former relation our apprehension changes nothing. And does the universal order of salvation really make our salvation dependent upon our own selves?

In regard to the intimation as though a difference existed between the author of the Pastoral Conference Theses, and the author of the Theses before synod, the assurance can be given that if a difference exists at all, it is not the one intimated, namely that the former includes more, and the latter include less, in the number of those who are infallibly ordained to eternal life. The author of the Theses laid before the Pastoral Conference has only said that the authors of the Apology to the Formula of Concord, and thus the authors of the Formula itself, use the terms, "elect" and "believers," as perfectly synonymous, understanding them to mean the same persons; and thus also speak of *elect* in the widest sense. This assertion he has proved from the Apology itself; but it has nothing to do with the disputed point; for all the brethren on this side agree that election taken in any sense infallibly ordains only those to eternal life who truly believe.

To the remark made that in our mode of expression we ought to use such terms as the Scriptures and the Confessions do, it was answered that in Thesis I. the committee really meant to set forth the doctrine taught in the Confession. How this Confession is to be understood we can certainly learn only from the Confession itself and from the explanation of it which has existed in our Church from the beginning. Now, it has been shown in part already how the Church in her earliest days understood this Confession. However, there are still a number of

clear citations to be made, which confirm the fact, that, according to the explanation of our oldest and ablest theologians, election as taught in the Confession, is the same in its widest sense. Compare the writings of the Rostock Theologians (among them Chytraeus and Bacmeister) against Huber, in which they positively say and repeat it, that the real *definition* of predestination according to the Scriptures and the Book of Concord, includes the mercy of God, the merits of Christ, and the promises of the Gospel. These men surely had the right and the ability to set forth the true understanding of the Confession. Chemnitz also, in the Brunswick Confession of 1570, which he helped to formulate, says: "The Scriptures however teach in regard to predestination that it has not this form and meaning, as when a steward concludes to kill some partridges which he has shut up, and to let the others fly, as Gerson uses this comparison, but that *predestination* INCLUDES *the whole decree of the redemption, call, justification, governing, and glorification.*" These surely are clear, unmistakable words, that convey nothing else but election in its widest sense. Thus the authors of the Formula of Concord teach in their private writings, and thus the Confession itself teaches when it says, Art. XI., § 24: "*All this is included*, according to the Scriptures, in the doctrine of God's eternal election unto the adoption of children and eternal life, and *is to be understood by it*, and never excluded or omitted," etc. It is maintained that the doctrine of election in its narrowest sense is the most comforting, yea a "comfort-dripping" doctrine. But if it is, why must the entire counsel of salvation be taken in connection with it in order to speak of it in a fruitful and consoling manner? In that case the comfort evidently does not lie in the election, but in the counsel of salvation which was added to it. Election is only *one*, but there are *several* essential parts belonging to it, none of which dare be omitted. If the Formula of Concord by the election which it teaches indeed means nothing more than the mere decree of God, "*this man shall and must believe, believe unto the end and be saved*," then it is, in short, no longer a Christian book, but rather a book of heresies. But, let it be well understood, we are confident, that the attempt to prove that the Formula of Concord speaks of *election in this sense* will forever fail. If man believes in consequence of a decree or ordinance of God it is a decree or ordinance that concerns *all* men,

and concerns them in an *equal manner*. The universal saving will of God cannot exist in connection with an election of certain individuals that is founded in any manner whatever, at the very outset, upon a particular will of God's grace. There is nothing remaining of it in that case but a mere wish of God. The Formula of Concord says that God's will is in time to bring the elect unto faith. Whence comes the difference between elect and non-elect? This presupposes something, namely that God foresaw who would believe and who would not believe. No one will ever be able to prove that the Formula of Concord speaks of election in the narrowest sense.

In answer to this one of the opponents remarked: That the Thesis is true in itself, decides nothing, nor is it the chief point; but whether it is here said that the Formula of Concord treats of election in its wider sense. If this is the case then the Thesis is not correct, even though according to its verbal reading it be true. The Formula says in that frequently mentioned place, Art. XI., § 14: "As Paul also treats of this article and declares, Rom. 8, 29. 30; Eph. 1, 4. 5." But how does Paul there treat of this matter? In the last passage he speaks of an election that took place before the foundation of the world, and in Romans 8, he treats of the entire saving counsel and will of God, as regards those who will actually be saved. If these Scripture passages are considered in connection with the Formula of Concord, it will be seen that the latter included also the the entire counsel of God unto salvation only so far as it refers to those who will actually be saved, i. e. the elect. The Epitome, point 4th also says, that election does not embrace all men, but only the children of God, and that it is the cause of their faith. It further says that election is the ordaining of the children of God unto eternal life, and thereby gives a brief and sufficient definition of election.

A brother earnestly regretted that in the debate the course had been adopted, first to inquire of the dogmaticians and the confessions. For the sake of our congregations and for our own clearness in the whole matter, it would have been fruitful, in his opinion, to have developed and set forth the true doctrine of election from the Scriptures. After that, the Fathers and the Confessions could also have been heard. In the manner now begun we would never arrive at a clear exposition of what really

is our doctrine of predestination. A motion to close the debate and take a vote upon the adoption of Thesis I. met with much opposition, inasmuch as unanimity had not yet been attained, and was therefore withdrawn.

Thereupon one of the opponents remarked in regard to Thesis I.: The question to be decided in this Thesis is, whether it is admissible, according to the Scriptures and the Confession, so to understand election that it embraces the entire purpose, counsel, will, and ordination of God, belonging to our redemption, call, justification, and salvation. The Scriptures do not tear apart the conception of election as is done when the same is spoken of in its widest, wider, and narrowest sense. This scholastic manner of expression is not that of the Scriptures. Of course all these essential points are mentioned in the Scriptures in connection with election, but they do not according to them constitute election itself. It was said that the attempt to prove that election in its narrowest sense is taught in the Confession, must eternally fail. Certainly, that it must, because the Confession knows nothing of such an election. That is decidedly a Calvinistic conception of election, that nothing belongs to it but this, that God has selected certain persons whom He will infallibly save. The Confession warns against that very thing, and advises us to accustom ourselves to speak of it in such a manner as to include the entire purpose, counsel, will, and ordination of God, if we would speak of it profitably. There is no such a thing as the now oft mentioned election in the narrowest sense. However, when the Confession says, that all this is to be included in speaking of election, that is not, according to the Confession, election itself. The Confession does not regard the general decree of salvation as election, but views it as the foundation of the same.

On the other side the answer was given, in the first place, to the remark that the doctrine of election ought first to have been set forth from the Scriptures, that it is customary among Lutherans to have recourse to the Confession, in order to see from them what is Lutheran. When that has been found, then it can justly be told any one that is not willing to receive it, that in this point he is not a Lutheran, and then prove to him also from the Scriptures, that the Lutheran doctrine at issue is in harmony also with the Word of God. We are therefore proceed-

ing in the right manner, when we ask the Confession. But what does the Confession teach in regard to this matter? In which of those senses, already frequently mentioned, does the Confession treat of election? That before, and at the time of its formulation, election had been spoken of in its widest sense, has already been proved from Luther. The second Martin, viz. Chemnitz, also regards the eternal appointment of the universal way of salvation as the chief part of election. It is correctly said: "The eternal *appointment* of the universal way of salvation," for to election belong only eternal decrees of God. Not the universal way of salvation itself, then, but the eternal appointment of that way, is a part of election. The judgment of Chemnitz ought to be a satisfactory guide as to the sense of the Confession, as every one must admit. Now, he says in his Examen Concilii Tridentini, his chief work: "The doctrine of predestination sets forth those decrees formed by God and afterward revealed in His Word, which pertain to the cause and manner of being saved or damned, as follows: 1. The decree of God to redeem mankind by the obedience and sufferings of the Mediator; 2. The decree, by means of the office of the Word, to call the Jews as well as the Gentiles unto the communion of the merits of Christ; 3. The decree that through His Holy Spirit, He would by the hearing of the Word, work in the hearts of men to the end that they might repent and believe the Gospel; 4. The decree that He would justify and save those who would by faith flee to the throne of grace, when they feel their sins and the wrath of God, and embrace the Mediator Christ who is set before them in the promises of the Gospel; but that He would damn all those who reject the Word, and despise the Promise." "This," says Chemnitz, "is the substance and analysis of the doctrine of predestination, as it is revealed in the Word." Now, some one may say, and it has been said: "That is certainly the substance of the *doctrine* of election but not election itself" or: "That is the doctrine of election as it is contained in the Word of God, but not election in the proper sense. If I want to speak of election in a profitable manner, I must of course take other doctrines in connection with it, as the Confession also says, but that is then not the definition itself." But is that applicable here? Chemnitz says nothing at all of taking anything in connection with it, in order to speak profitably of elec-

tion, but he speaks of election itself, when he sets forth the substance and analysis of the doctrine. He mentions several parts belonging to election, and these taken as a whole constitute his definition of election. The same thing Chemnitz also teaches in his sermon on the 20th Sunday after Trinity (Postill II. p. 551), in which he says, after having mentioned all the parts of the order of salvation: "This is the simple understanding and meaning of that which belongs to divine *predestination*, is *embraced* by it, and *in which it consists*, so that we take all these parts together when we speak or think of *predestination* or divine election, in the same manner as St. Paul in the whole 1st chapter of Ephesians treats of and explains this doctrine one part after the other." Here he directly maintains that all the parts of the common order of salvation belong to *election itself*, and not only to the *doctrine* of it, and that the Scriptures in Eph. 1 teach in the same manner, that is, of election in its widest sense. With this the conclusion of the already mentioned part of the confession of the city of Brunswick made in 1570, perfectly harmonizes: "*Predestination* (*election* itself and not only the *doctrine* of it) *includes the whole decree of the redemption, call, justification, governing and glorification.*" Finally the Enchiridion or Handbook of Chemnitz remains to be compared, in which he in 1574, when the Formula of Concord was already being considered, inserted a section on predestination, which not only forms the foundation of Art. XI., Formula of Concord, but corresponds to it almost word for word. In this he clearly and plainly represents the eternal appointment of the universal way of salvation as the chief part of election. He says there first: "As to that which is good, God not only sees and knows it beforehand, but it is His gracious will and good pleasure that it should be. He is the source of all good, creates and causes it, and helps and furthers it. And *this* is called in the church, predestination, election, or foreordination, as regards eternal life and salvation. Then follow, as "parts included in and understood by election," the 8 points of the Formula of Concord, which are distinctly represented as the divinely decreed, universal way of salvation for *all* men, and not only for the elect. For even the last decrees mentioned in points 7 and 8 are made conditional by an "if." Immediately after these 8 points and without having said one word about the election of individuals, Chemnitz pro-

ceeds: "All this, according to the Scriptures, *is included* in it, is meant by it, and *is to be understood*, when the purpose, predestination, election, and ordination of God unto salvation are spoken of. Now whilst Chemnitz, in his "Examination of the Council of Trent," where he only defines predestination in order to show over against the Romanists that election as revealed in the Word of God, does not cause the certainty of salvation and the confidence of believers to waver, but confirms and strengthens the same, adds nothing concerning an election of individuals, (from which it is also seen that he founds the certainty of salvation upon nothing else than the universal way of salvation) he has, in his Enchiridion, where he desires to treat of the matter in full, also inserted concerning the election of individuals as the result of the chief part, the following question and answer: "Has the eternal predestination of God reference only to the act of salvation, and not also to the persons that will be saved?" Answer: "In this article the Scriptures always include the persons of the elect, for it is not to be understood as though God alone prepares salvation for all, but that the persons that are saved must and can of themselves and by their own power and ability seek how they might attain to it; but God has in His gracious purpose remembered each and every elect person that shall be saved through Christ, has predestinated and elected such unto salvation, and also ordained how He would by His grace, gifts, and work bring them into the possession of it, and further and preserve them in it." Something similar to this we also find in the Formula of Concord. The latter likewise first mentions the 8 decrees, or the appointment of the universal way of salvation, as a constituent part of election. Then it also speaks in § 23 of the election of persons, and of the decree self-evidently connected with it, that they shall be saved upon this universal way of salvation. These 8 points, according to the Formula of Concord, thus contain the chief part of election. But in connection with this it is not to be forgotten, that, *in accordance with the rule laid down in this chief part*, God has also infallibly ordained certain persons to the obtaining of salvation, and so very well knows the persons elect and will save them by means of the general way of salvation. And then in § 24 it is also said as by Chemnitz: "All this is, according to the Scriptures, included in the doctrine of God's eternal election

unto the adoption of sons and salvation, and is to be understood by it and never excluded or omitted when election is spoken of." It is an altogether untenable objection that a distinction must be made here between the *doctrine* of election and *election itself*, on the ground that whatever must be *included* in the doctrine and *understood by it* does not on that account *essentially* belong to election. If the clear and simple words of the Confession were to be understood in this manner, it might be truthfully said that the authors, who certainly understood German very well, expressed themselves in a manner most liable to be misunderstood.—It was also further remarked on this side, that the brethren on the other side, to our great joy, have acknowledged, that the Confession when it speaks of election, does not mean only the decree that this and that person shall be saved; and they have also admitted that this is Calvinistic doctrine. Notwithstanding this, however, what is said in Thesis I. is in their opinion not correct. We wish they would for once positively say what in their opinion the Formula of Concord means by election. They have expressed themselves in this manner: "Election is the ordination of individuals to salvation and all that belongs to it." The Formula of Concord first sets forth the difference between foreknowledge and predestination, and calls the first a knowledge which is not causal, but predestination is causal. With this something definite is predicated of predestination, that is a part of its conception, and therefore belongs to its definition. Let us now examine § 8 in its different parts. There it is first said, that election is an act of God, by which He ordains everything belonging to my salvation, according to which He has resolved to call me, to bring me to faith, to sanctify and finally to save me. All these resolutions belong to the ordination of God, ordaining my salvation. But these do not include me only, but all men. Is the decree then to call me, one that concerns not only me, but all men, it certainly is a part of election in the wider sense. And so it is in regard to every one of the resolutions that follow, down to the last one which does not have reference to all, but only to the individuals that will actually be saved. Therefore the Formula of Concord says, that election is a decree embracing the children of God. Which, now, of these decrees is the one the brethren call election?

In reply to these remarks, objection was raised by one of the

opponents to the form of the first and also the second Thesis. In both of them the "if" is the ruling element, and if we accept them, we have thereby not sounded a clear note. If any one would then ask, what has synod confessed to be her doctrine, and we should have to answer: "If by election you understand this, then we teach thus; but if by election you understand this, then we teach so and so,"—certainly this answer, the only one possible, would be a sad testimony of the confessional standpoint of synod. It seems that the Thesis is intended to establish the fact that the Confession speaks of election in the widest sense. This ought to be proven, for in our conviction the Confession speaks of election in the proper, and not in the widest sense. The former speaker who desired to know how we really define election, we will answer that our definition will be found sufficiently given in part 4 of the Epitome. It is an act of God that embraces the beloved children of God, and therefore not all men, but only individuals.

To this certainly the entire plan of salvation cannot belong. Election, as such, is the cause of salvation and all that belongs to it. For the latter is evident already from the former, according to which it is the cause of salvation; for then election must provide also for everything necessary unto salvation, namely, the call, justification, sanctification, and salvation. All this is to be included, then, in the definition of election, and I speak of election correctly if I omit none of these parts mentioned here. We have here indeed a correct and sufficient definition of election, and not only the difference between foreknowledge and predestination set forth.

It was further remarked on the same side, that it is not altogether appropriate and suitable that many things must be mentioned here which are hard for an ordinary Christian to understand. We would certainly have discussed the matter more profitably if we had pursued a different course, and first set forth the doctrine of election from the Scriptures. How the great teachers of our church taught is well known, and also, that they here and there built wood, hay, and stubble upon the only true foundation. But when it is said that Martin Chemnitz by predestination understands the eternal appointment of the universal way of salvation, this is altogether without foundation. In his "Examination of the Council of Trent," he does not at all

treat of election in its connection, but speaks of it only with particular reference to the false doctrine of the Romanists. In his Loci however he speaks ex professo of election, and there expresses himself as follows: "Predestination is predicated of the special act of God in the elect, according to which He calls, justifies, and saves." He does not mention the eternal appointment of the universal way of salvation in connection with election as such, but he says it is that which God does in the elect. In the same manner he also says in his Enchiridion: "God has, in His eternal counsel, according to His gracious purpose, considered each and every elect person, who is to be saved through Christ, has predestinated and elected them unto salvation, and decreed that by His grace, gifts, and operation He would bring *them* into possession of it, and further and preserve them in it." (Frank, Theol. of the F. C. IV. 336.)

Here too Chemnitz speaks of predestination as an act of God, which embraces each and every elect person, whom He considered in His gracious purpose. The 8 points of the Enchiridion were mentioned awhile ago and particular stress was laid upon the "if"—IF they believe, *if* they continue steadfast. Certainly, the Scriptures speak in a similar manner, desiring to admonish the elect to watch and pray, and continue in God's Word, in order to be preserved from carnal security. The comfort of election is only for believers, and not for the impenitent and unbelieving. On our side there is no unconditional election taught. With God the number of those who will be saved is of course fixed, and a decree is formed by Him in regard to them, but not an unconditional one. God of course cannot err, His decree is infallible; but we are bound to the order of salvation; for us the decree is a conditional one.

Another speaker of the opponents expressed his joy that the other side was beginning to see that the charge of holding Calvinistic doctrine is unfounded. He considered that a proof, that these brethren had not yet really learned the doctrine of their opponents, and had consequently been engaging in a warfare void of an object. It has been said, the same speaker continued, that the dogmaticians are all on that side, inasmuch as they distinguish between election in its widest, wider, and narrowest sense. We do not deny this. But we do maintain that those men did not teach this doctrine in the same manner as our

brethren do on the opposite side. They had to battle against Calvinists and their election of wrath, which accounts for their manner of expression. But we are not bound to the Fathers; they too could and have erred. Luther has also been mentioned, but he was not correctly represented. He himself says that he here teaches a doctrine that is strong meat, and therefore can not be understood by everyone. However, he only speaks of election in its own proper sense, so far as it embraces only the elect children of God. His words are easily understood with this conception of election, but not with election in its widest sense. For it does not flow from the eternal appointment of the universal way of salvation who shall not believe, but from the perverted nature of man.

Further, Chemnitz has been quoted. It is a mistake when it is said that in his Enchiridion election is taught in the widest sense. That would indeed give a good reason for a similar explanation of the Formula of Concord. But the matter does not stand thus. Where he calls God the Cause of all good, and then mentions predestination, he adds, "as regards eternal life and salvation," and thus only declares predestination to be the cause of the life and salvation of *the elect.*

The discussion at this point was interrupted for a while, as synod was informed that a letter containing some Theses, with appended remarks, had been sent in by Pastor Humberger. Synod referred the letter to a committee consisting of Profs. C. H. L. Schuette, F. W. Stellhorn, and Past. G. H. Trebel, to report on the same. An invitation of the Superintendent of the Orphans' Home in Wheeling was also laid before synod. With thanks for the invitation, synod expressed regret for being necessitated to decline the same for want of time. Then a resolution was offered with the view of bringing about a rapid decision on the part of synod as to her position in the present controversy. This resolution was laid on the table for the present in order to afford still further opportunity for the exchange of opinions, and it was *resolved* to continue the discussion of the Thesis.

A motion was made by one of the authors of the Theses to extend the discussion also to the II. Thesis, inasmuch as the adoption of the one already demands the adoption of the other, and previously to insert a few words in each of the Theses,

namely in the I. Thesis, immediately after the beginning: "If by election we understand," the addition, "as does the Formula of Concord;" and in the II. Thesis after "understand" the words: "As do the dogmaticians generally."

After this motion was carried, the speaker, who had been interrupted by these several occurrences as just described, continued his explanations, and remarked that he had intended to show in detail that the oldest teachers of our church, just as little as the Formula of Concord, taught an election in the widest sense, but that he would now desist from this, in order to help synod to obtain a clear view of the situation. He would try to show in what points the two parties in our midst agree and in what points not. After he had done this in a precise manner, it had to be declared that his entire explanation, on account of its not having any bearing upon the I. Thesis, was out of order, on account of which the next speaker could not enter upon a consideration of the same.

However it was later *resolved*, (and is mentioned here because it was done after the reading of the Minutes containing this occurrence) that a committee consisting of Pastor P. Brand, Prof. C. H. L. Schuette, Pastor G. F. H. Meiser, Prof. F. W. Stellhorn, Pastor H. Henkel, and Pastor G. H. Trebel, should formulate those certain points in which the agreement and difference of the parties in our midst shall be clearly set forth, having reference in their work to the points formulated by the brother above referred to, and lay the result of their work before synod.

The following speaker, one of the authors of the Theses, then further remarked in regard to the I. Thesis. This Thesis gives a definition of election, and says that this is the doctrine which the Confession teaches. It has been sufficiently proved that at the time the Formula of Concord was written that manner of expression was in use, as we maintain, and that the fathers have in the same manner understood the Confession. The opponents have not refuted this, but to the question as to what their definition of election is, they have thus far given no answer, or only an insufficient one. The answer given by one of the brethren on the other side, was: "Election is an *act* of God, whilst the Confession itself calls it an *ordination*, which thus consists of *decrees*. God's will is that all men should be saved. But they will not all be saved; nor has God decreed

that all should be saved. What God has *decreed* must be done, but not so unconditionally also, that which He *wills*. Now we ask the brethren to express themselves, whether God has formed such a decree in regard to a few persons to the exclusion and ignoring of all others, as follows: "This person I will bring to faith, enlighten him, sanctify him," etc. We want to be safe against Calvinistic doctrine, wherefore we want the plain truth in regard to *this*, whether the eternal decree of God with reference to His working out salvation, concerns individuals only, or all men. The Formula of Concord claims to speak of that election *of which* the Scripture speaks, and refers to Matt. 22, for an example. Now in Matt. 22 election is spoken of. Is election there spoken of in the narrow or in the wider sense? There the will of God is clear, that He wants all; that is the extent of the call, and those who comply with God's order, are the elect. Is that an eternal decree of God without reference to faith? Certainly not. It is irrefutably clear, that the Scriptures here, as also the Formula of Concord, regard the election of persons as regulated, and as directed by the foresight of God. By another speaker the opponents were asked, where does the decree belong: "This John, Peter, Michael, shall be saved." Has God without any further regard decreed that these individuals shall be saved, and then ordained the means of salvation for that purpose, or is not election in its conception to be viewed as the last decree of God, so that everything else, the entire divinely ordained way of salvation precedes it? That which makes election particular is not a special decree of God in that direction, but it is the fault of man that the universal gracious will of God is not realized by the great majority.

That speaker on the opposite side who thought he had found a sufficient definition of election in point 4th of the Epitome, was shown that in the point mentioned, there are indeed three essential elements or parts of a correct definition contained, namely, first, the category that it is a decree, then the limits, and finally, the effect of election. However all these are by no means sufficient to a complete and correct definition, as it was not intended either by the authors of the Formula of Concord to give such a definition here; for in that case these highly educated men, so unsurpassable in close logical thinking and manner of presentation, would certainly have presented some-

thing better. If a school boy were to give a definition of anything in that kind of a manner, his definition could and would not be considered at all, much less dare we ascribe to the authors of the Formula of Concord, that they hereby intended to give us their definition. Just this very 4th point clearly proves, what has frequently been maintained, that it is not the object to define election here, but only to state its relation to the foreknowledge of God.

To that one of the opponents who had said that election was not unconditional but conditional and regulated, the question was put: By what then is it conditioned? Is it by the merits of Christ? That cannot be, since the merits of Christ are valid for all men. Or is it by faith? Neither can that be, for according to the assertions of our opponents we are elected *unto* faith, and not in view of faith. Thus faith, as the result and effect of election, can not rationally be said to be the condition and rule of election. By what then, in the conception of our opponents, is election conditioned?

Again the discussion was interrupted by a dispatch being laid before synod, from the President of the Synodical Conference, Prof. L. Larsen, who in view of the present circumstances proposed to synod the postponement of the meeting of the Synodical Conference set for October next, until the different synods had taken further action in regard to the pending question. Synod referred this dispatch to the I. Committee to report on the same.

Thereupon one of the opponents replied, by way of answer to the questions put, first to the question, as to which definition of election these brethren claim as theirs. He said: It is indeed difficult to give a definition that will satisfy every one in all its parts. This, the discussion thus far has shown. If our Confession had given a definition in accord with the theology of the schools, which however can not be made to appear at all from the Confession itself, that the authors ever had that purpose, then we could stand upon that. Now attention has been called to the 4th point of the Epitome. That ought to be sufficient for this purpose; for election is there defined in its chief parts to a sufficient extent. But there is a definition given in detail in the §§ 13–24 of the Solida Declaratio. The entire counsel of grace is included in the conception of election, yea,

even the redemption. I cannot correctly think or speak of election if I exclude redemption. Therefore the speaker cannot be satisfied with the different conceptions of election, which the theologians have held. If one desires to speak correctly of it, he ought not to speak of a selection only, nor even in such a manner as though there were a part of it that did not embrace all men, because the Formula of Concord says, all this should be taken together to speak correctly concerning it. The three modes of expression can indeed be rightly used, but the best expression seems to be, that of election in its proper sense. In that all ought to be then included that belongs to a complete definition of the conception, thus, for example, also the call. Point 4th of the Epitome, then, as the same is more extensively set forth in the Solida Declaratio, would give the best definition. Only it must not be forgotten in this connection, that the 8 points do not refer to the universal way of salvation so far as the same is intended for all men, but so far as the elect are led on this way, according to Rom. 8. This is also proven by § 40, where it is said the universal way of salvation is to be considered with reference to the elect. Furthermore, we were asked to explain in what respect we regard election conditional when we say, that God has decreed to save certain persons, and still call this election conditional. This was said by way of reproach, as though we taught an absolute election. God has not in His election seen any condition in man, but He elects in a certain order, namely in Christ, that is, those who are in Christ by faith, and that by persevering faith. Whoever is brought on the universal way of salvation to salvation, he is an elect person. God has according to His grace resolved, by the redemption that was effected through Christ, to save according to *this* rule: He that believeth shall be saved. That anyone imagines himself to be an elect person, does not decide the matter. He is mistaken if he is not pursuing the universal way of salvatjon and suffering himself to be led upon it. The expression: "God has decreed to save His elect," dare not, then, be taken separate from the merits of Christ and from faith, otherwise it would be Calvinistic. Grace is never particular, but election is. The existence of a decree which embraces only certain persons, not known to us, but to God, cannot be denied. This § 23, and also § 48 of the Solida Declaratio shows, where the purpose of God to

lead His elect through tribulation unto salvation, is called a decree, which thus embraces only the elect. Not, as though God would not do it with the rest also, but only this is, according to the Formula of Concord, included in election. The Confession does not say that God ordained them unto this. This then is a decree. The difference between God's will, and His decree, is recognized by the dogmaticians.

Even those theologians who use the so-called second *tropus* in teaching, make a difference, on the basis of God's Word, between God's will and decree. Thus, e. g., Balthesar Meisner writes: "*Will* is the general term and embraces also those things which do not come to pass. Thus God wills that all men should attentively hear His Word, which, however, is never done. But the *purpose* of God embraces that which certainly occurs. For what God purposes, takes place without exception. The *decree* of God is a still narrower ground, namely when God *ordains* that He will accomplish, through certain means, that which He purposes to do. We therefore have the following order: God wills something; He purposes to do that which He wills; what He has purposed, He decrees; and thus these three differ as the wider and the narrower, the antecedent and the consequent." Quoted from *Lehre und Wehre*, October, 1858, page 293. There is therefore no difference between the universal gracious will and the decree of election respecting the elect. With reference to Matt. 22 it cannot be admitted that election is there spoken of in the wider sense, for there is no such an election. The whole matter is embraced in verse 14. In the preceding verses the way of salvation is described and those who stand upon it. All are called, but only some *are* elected. The word *are* refers to an election before the time of the world.

Hereupon another speaker, belonging to the opponents, continued the discussion as follows: It is maintained, according to the Thesis, that our Confession treats of election in the widest sense. So Chemnitz, it is claimed, also teaches. But the brethren omit the word *doctrine* as found in the Confession. It makes a great difference whether I speak of *election* or of the *doctrine* of election. There is also another defect, namely the insertion of the word *redemption* in the second half of the Thesis. This word is found very properly at the beginning; but is it meant that the redemption is also a result of election? The Confession and

the Scriptures say that we are elected in Christ. They thus presuppose the redemption in speaking of election. No doubt the word was inserted merely to enable one to say that election is a cause. Election is said to be accomplished according to the general order of salvation, in this that God resolves to save those whom He sees upon the way of salvation in the end. Thus election is at last nothing but God's foresight of faith. Why then still speak of an election? Because the Bible speaks of election. But neither the Bible nor the Confession speaks of election as being an applying of the gracious will of God to those whom God foresaw as finally believing. Section 5 of the Solida Declaratio says that election is the ordaining of God's children unto salvation. His decree, His ordination, must be fulfilled. But of course He does not force the elect, but in the same way and through the same grace intended for all, He will also, and that certainly, save the elect. These are the ones who are certainly saved. The Confession calls election a cause of salvation, but not for all men, but only for the elect that will certainly be saved; and upon this our, that is, the elect's, salvation is so firmly grounded that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. Thus the Confession says that no man who is elected can be lost. The passage, Acts 13, 48, is indeed variously interpreted, but the Formula of Concord takes it in the sense: As many as were ordained, elected, to eternal life believed. The Confession gives its definition of election clearly and distinctly in §§ 5 and 8 of the XI. Article of the Solida Declaratio. It is not so peculiarly arranged that we are obliged to read 13 paragraphs before we find out in which sense it speaks of election. The Confession brings in the 8 points after a definition has already been given, just as in the Epitome, which does not contain the 8 points, a definition is already found in the 4th section, and a better one cannot be given. Nor do the 8 points follow for the purpose of showing how God finally arrives at an election, in that He waits along the whole way of salvation and finally makes those His elect whom He, so to speak, sees in heaven, but to the end that we may accustom ourselves to speak in such a manner as to embrace the whole doctrine of redemption, in order that we may speak profitably concerning election. In this way the Confession appeals to the Word of God itself, which treats of election in a similar manner, to show that it desires the

whole doctrine to be taken into consideration. If now we examine the 8 points we find from the second one on already the word *us*, which means the elect, as is clearly seen from the Scripture passages referred to. Matt. 22 has been cited and explained as though an election in the widest sense were here taught. But this is an error. God has prepared a marriage feast for all. He extends a call to all. Many despise the call and do not come at all. Some, however, have a wedding garment on. How does this come about? Because some do not accept the call at all, others do it only apparently. But how is it in regard to Rom. 8? Does that also speak of election in the widest sense? The apostle speaks immediately of those whom God predestinated, and then he says that He also calls them. Therefore the general order of salvation is here also taken into consideration only so far as it refers to the elect, for Paul is speaking only of these. The same is true of Eph. 1. What is told us here certainly has reference only to the elect. Even if some among the Ephesians may not have been saved, yet Paul here speaks, in charity, of all who heeded the call. These "us" He elected, *in order* that we might become believers, *in order* that we might remain in faith, and *in order* that we might finally be saved. As these passages speak of the elect and of the way in which God desires to save them, so also does the Confession in the 8 points. The seventh point is not against us, for the elect also need to be admonished and warned and to hold faithfully to the Word, that is, diligently to use the means of grace. From this election the Confession derives a great and sweet consolation, namely for the elect, which the brethren on the other side cannot have at all, inasmuch as they make the comfort of faith contingent on their perseverance and continuance in grace. These 8 points also occur substantially in §§ 30–32; but there too the elect are meant, and the way of salvation is taken into consideration only so far as it refers to the elect. They also occur again substantially in §§ 67–76, where, as before, the elect and the saving work of the Holy Ghost in them are spoken of. If we thus understand the Confession, we find the true election, an election not in the widest, wider or narrower, but in the proper sense, which refers to those who are actually saved and is a cause of their salvation. And with this the whole XI. Article harmonizes most beautifully.

In reply to this lengthy exposition of the opposite doctrine only the following could be stated, on account of the nearness of the time for adjournment. That the Formula of Concord does not intend to give a definition of election in section 4 of the Epitome, is certainly evident from the connection. The Formula of Concord says that it does not desire to speak of such an election as would be identical with the foreknowledge of God. Then it tells us where we should seek this election, namely in the Word of God, and this Word reveals it to us, namely so that we are to seek it in Christ. But Christ calls to Himself *all* sinners, and it is His earnest desire that all men should come to Him and permit themselves to be helped. But that is the establishment of the universal order of salvation. Such, too, is the case in the Solida Declaratio. In the latter it is positively stated that *all* men are to seek their election in Christ. But this would be dreadful mockery, if election were nevertheless, in the very outset, intended only for *some*. In those passages which clearly and plainly set forth God's universal grace and counsel, such as John 3, 16, and similar ones, election, according to the Confession, is to be sought. If it is revealed to us in these passages, then the meaning is that election, so far as its chief part is concerned, is the establishment of the universal order of salvation. So we understand the Formula of Concord, and so has the Lutheran Church always understood it. Pray, show us a single one of the fathers of our Church who does not so understand the Formula of Concord. But can any one with a good conscience assert, after all our statements and explanations, that we have an election which is nothing more than the foresight of God? Even election in the widest sense is a *decree*, or rather a sum total of *decrees*, and not mere foreknowledge. It is incorrect to say that section 4 of the Epitome contains a definition; for it merely asserts that election *is something that takes the children of God to heaven*. But that is no more a definition than when I say that a knife is a wood-cutting instrument, or that a sleigh is an implement for conveying men. The 8 points, of which we have just heard a false interpretation, are each and all so many co-ordinate decrees which are embraced in election, as the Formula of Concord says; the first decree, namely the one *to redeem all men*, is just as well a part of election as are the rest. It is, moreover, a futile undertaking to try to conjure up

such a difference between the *doctrine* of election and *election* itself as has anything to do with our explanations. In the 22d chapter of Matthew the *order* is revealed unto us *according to which election takes place*—the *rule, according to which God elects.* No other meaning can be forced from it. So far as the first chapter of Ephesians is concerned, Luther teaches that the apostle here speaks of election in the widest sense, in which of course the narrow sense is included. The relative clause in Acts 13, 48—"As many as were ordained to eternal life"—is not causal. "*As many as* were ordained" does not mean: "*because*" they were ordained to eternal life. No; but this is the meaning: As many as had permitted themselves to be led in the order of faith. The Greek word here used for *ordained* is employed no where else in the Scriptures in reference to election. The attempt was made to explain the word "if" in the 7th of the 8 points under consideration as if it were meant to admonish the elect to exercise faithfulness, diligence, etc. But this point is also an eternal decree of God. The elect, it is said, shall and must be saved. Do those who say this not consider what nonsense is foisted upon this point, if we were obliged, according to said explanation, to say: "The elect shall and must be infallibly saved according to an eternal decree of God;" and then after all to add: "God has decreed to save them only *if* they hold fast to God's Word, pray diligently, persevere in His grace and faithfully use the gifts received?" In the first place God has *unalterably settled* the matter, and yet He afterwards resolves within Himself that it shall occur *only under a certain condition!* Furthermore, the charge of synergism is hurled in all directions, and yet, in spite of all the efforts made, no proof can be produced that there is even the slightest vestige of it on our side. Has the language of the Formula of Concord, say in points 4 and 7, ever been looked at in respect to this charge? Does not the Confession here speak more "synergistically" than we have ever done? Why then not also reject the Confession at the same time? Finally it was said that our doctrine affords us no comfort. In fact, the reverse is the case. Our opponents, according to *their* doctrine, if they draw the inevitable inferences following from the same, have no comfort at all, not in the least; they do not even retain the comfort of the universal order of salvation. For the latter of itself, according to their doctrine, brings no man into heaven;

but a special secret decree of God, that pertains only to certain persons, must, according to their opinion, be conjoined with that order. This then affords a consolation, as their leaders express it, which, like some fine, exquisite wine that is not intended for every one but only for old, hoary-headed persons, does not belong to every Christian, but only to those who have grown old and gray. We, however, have true comfort in God's eternal, universal plan of salvation, and indeed for every penitent sinner. We have a universal order of salvation that really brings men to heaven, through which God wants to save all men, and therefore me also, and in such a manner in fact that I, who am unable to do anything, also have nothing to do in the work. He leads, yea He lifts, He carries us to the promised goal; we need only submit to His guidance, and even to do this He gives us the necessary grace and strength. This is true comfort.

After the debate had been thus far conducted by others, the President took the floor and spoke as follows: This is the fourth day since the discussion began, and it has no doubt not been entirely fruitless. It is evident that there are none among us who consciously hold Calvinistic doctrine, and also that there is no one among us who teaches synergistically. If any one is in danger of falling into such false doctrine, the discussion may have helped him to recognize such danger and to avoid it. In this respect we could perhaps accomplish still more by continuing the debate still longer; but in that way we will not come to a decision, for which purpose, however, synod has been convened. Under existing circumstances, however, we must express ourselves clearly as a synod. It were desirable to have these doctrinal discussions continued hereafter, but now it is necessary that we state how our synod stands respecting the controverted question. Perhaps there are some among us who fear to express themselves clearly on account of the Synodical Conference and in order not to offend other synods. Would it then not be better for us entirely to withdraw from the Synodical Conference? Under the present circumstances our remaining in that body has no longer any purpose to serve. But there are perhaps members in our own synod with whom some may think it impossible any longer to labor together, for example, the teachers in our Institutions. With respect to this point also an expression should be given, in order that our Professors may know

what to do. In like manner it is necessary that we take a decided stand in reference to our publications. Should a minority not yet be able to vote *Yea*, the differences among us still seem to be of such a character as not to prevent us from laboring together in a brotherly way and to help each other to obtain greater clearness.

Hereupon it was *Resolved*, That we take up for discussion the resolutions which had been presented on a former occasion and temporarily laid on the table. Following are the resolutions:

Resolved, I. That the Joint Synod of Ohio and other States, much as it regrets the step, herewith separates itself from the Synodical Conference of North America, because the honorable Synod of Missouri, which, as is known, represents the great majority of the Synodical Conference, has

1. Set forth and definitely adopted (last May) a doctrine concerning election which we cannot accept; and

2. Has definitely declared that it cannot confer with the majority of the delegates our districts have elected this year, because they have felt it to be their duty publicly to declare that the above-mentioned doctrine is Calvinizing;

II. That we do not consider the difference which has thus far manifested itself in our synod in reference to the doctrine of election, to be of a church-dividing character;

III. That in the future as in the past we confess the old Lutheran doctrine, that the election of those persons who are infallibly saved took place in view of the merits of Christ apprehended by faith.

After these resolutions had been read it was resolved that the III. one be discussed first. A substitute for the III. resolution was offered to the following effect:

OUR POSITION ON THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION.

We again herewith confess the doctrine of election as it is contained in the Formula of Concord, and also as it has in accordance therewith been always taught on the whole by the great teachers of our church; especially do we hold the doctrine of our fathers, that the ordination of the elect to eternal life took place in view of faith, i. e., in view of the merits of Christ appropriated by faith, to be in accord with the Scriptures and our Confessions; Therefore,

Resolved, That in the future as in the past the doctrine here anew confessed be alone authorized in our institutions, schools, publications and churches.

In explanation of this substitute it was remarked that there have always been two ways of teaching (Lehrtropen) in the church in respect to the doctrine of election: that (the tropus) of the Formula of Concord and that of the dogmaticians. Both are Lutheran, and both are therefore authorized. In the controversy concerning the doctrine of election we have not spoken against the *tropus* (mode of teaching) of the Formula of Concord, but against a new, false doctrine that is trying to hide itself behind that *tropus*. The doctrine confessed in the substitute is to be taught in our seminary, churches, schools and publications; and only a doctrine *opposed* to the one contained in the two modes of teaching (Tropen) is to be rejected. The Ohio Synod has had a position on this doctrine ever since she subscribed the Formula of Concord. The question is simply whether we intend to continue to hold our position or to accept something new.

To this one of the opponents replied that it would be a glorious thing if we could unanimously subscribe the Formula of Concord in this point. But the debate has shown that we are not a unit in our understanding of that Confession. It is therefore not advisable to give our assent without being conscious that we are heartily agreed. So far as the confession of the doctrine of the fathers is concerned, it must be said that on the whole they remained on the true foundation, although they built wood, hay and stubble upon it. It is a fact that, in part, they teach differently concerning this point also both in thought and expression, as e. g., in reference to the certainty of salvation. It is therefore not a Lutheran way of doing to permit ourselves to be bound to the fathers, especially in reference to such a point as has been received and taught in such various ways. Both modes of teaching have been used in the church, but in our day those are declared to be heretics who employ the first *tropus* and, in order to preclude every error, reject the second. How then can we say that both modes of teaching have always been authorized? I do not believe that any one of our teachers is heretical on account of the intuitu fidei doctrine. I also could discuss this matter fraternally with the brethren for years. But if this new thing is the doctrine of the synod, then has it become manifest during these days that the matter to many is still something that is not clear, but new and unknown. If the Ohio

Synod really always stood so and that every one knows it, as is here affirmed, then I at least knew nothing of it when I entered the synod.

In answer to this it was said that it was not entirely useless for us here to confess the doctrine of the Formula of Concord. For if any one now votes for the resolution, after having heard the previous discussion, he does it in the sense that is here explained. In regard to the fathers our desire is to confess their doctrine *intuitu fidei* (in view of faith) and to confess that in fact which they meant thereby, and also in opposition to the same false doctrines. Such false doctrines have certainly been condemned by us. It has been admitted by the other side that things have been said which can easily be misunderstood. We do not want an unconditional election unto faith taught in the church. If election is not unconditional, what is the condition? It is heretical to preach in this manner: In spite of the fact that God will have all men to be saved and to come to a knowledge of the truth, He nevertheless from eternity, without further consideration, elected a small number and decreed to save these, i. e., to bring them to faith, to keep them in it, etc. For the precious doctrine of universal grace is overthrown by such preaching. What is meant by such a statement as this: I am elected unto faith; another equally poor sinner is not elected unto faith? Is not this a very dangerous way of speaking? Therefore the expression *in view of faith* shall continue to be honored, having always been taught in our synod without any divergence whatever toward synergism. For no one has ever thought of such a thing, that faith is thereby made a work or a merit.

In compliance with the wish expressed by the English speaking brethren the honored President made the following explanation in English. He began by saying that he desired *action* rather than speaking. Enough has been said, and the brethren on the side to which he, as all know, belongs, had faithfully expressed his meaning. It is now absolutely necessary to give a clear expression as the decision of synod, without thereby blocking up the way against subsequent discussion. The last address delivered on the other side was of such a nature as to indicate that the division between us is not incurable. The doctrine that God, without any further consideration whatever, elected certain definite persons, is the one to which we

stand opposed. The Formula of Concord has a special mode of teaching in reference to the doctrine of election. But with it the fathers, though using different language, entirely agree; and there is not one among them who did not desire to express the doctrine of the Formula by means of his language and who does not stand in full harmony with that Confession. God will have all men to be saved. He has also done all in order to carry out His will by sending and offering up His Son Jesus Christ and by an earnest call that is equally and earnestly intended for all according to God's will. But just here it has lately been said that God sent His Son for all, but then decreed that only certain ones should be saved through Him. There is only a slight difference between this doctrine and Calvinism. God desires to save the whole world, but He saw a difference among men. He saw that the majority would reject His Son and wantonly and obstinately resist His grace. In these, on account of their own fault, He could not carry on His work, as the Formula of Concord says. The others who embrace the merits of Christ by His grace, and who are known to Him as such from eternity, He elected. This is the doctrine that has hitherto been taught in our synod. This is the doctrine which we now intend to confess.

One of the brethren expressed the wish that an explanation be added to the words, "*in view of faith*," to the effect that we accept this expression exactly in the same sense in which the older dogmaticians of our church used it, in order to rid ourselves of every charge that our teaching is in any way synergistic. He received the earnest answer, however, that it is really inconceivable that such an additional clause should be deemed necessary, now that during the debate, carried on for several days, clear and explicit statements and sincere explanations have repeatedly been given, and that too in reference to this very point. We almost despair of our ability ever to make it plain that we do not teach synergistically to those who yet do not see that in using said expression we, like the fathers, are free from synergism of every description.

After the substitute had again been brought before synod, and that in the form given above, it was resolved that a vote be taken upon it by calling for the ayes and noes.

The following pastors and lay delegates voted, with whom,

according to a resolution of synod, those also are counted who either were not present when the roll was called—although they had been present during the discussion—or were not yet decided and afterwards handed in their votes.

A.—Those Voting for the Substitute—Aye.

I. PASTORS.

NORTHERN DISTRICT.

J. Bauch,	J. C. Elrich,	C. Lembke,	J. A. Schulze,
E. A. Born,	F. Epplíng,	W. C. Lembke,	J. J. Sutter,
C. Buechler,	S. Hunziker,	P. H. Mueller,	A. E. Ulrich,
C. Clessler,	J. Krieger,	S. Poppen,	A. B. Weber,
G. Cronenwett,	J. Kucher,	G. F. Reitz,	F. N. Wolf.
L. Dammann,	H. Lang,	J. Schmierer,	

WESTERN DISTRICT.

C. H. Althoff,	C. F. Huebner,	O. Priwer,	J. Siermanns,
F. W. Althoff,	Th. H. Jaeger,	C. G. Reichert,	Prof. F. W. Stellhorn,
W. Bauermeister,	J. M. Koepplin,	Prof. E. Schmid,	G. H. Trebel,
J. Dingeldey,	G. Loewenstein,	Ph. Schmidt,	H. Wiekemeyer,
G. Doepken,	W. Luedeman,	W. Schmidt,	F. C. Wiechers,
A. J. Feger,	Prof. Theo. Mees,	P. G. Schmogrow,	G. Wolf.
E. Gerfen,	C. H. Mayer,	H. J. Schuh,	
R. Graetz,	A. Michaelis,	C. A. Schulze,	
C. E. Herbst,	W. Niebuhr,	W. J. Schroyer,	

EASTERN DISTRICT.

F.C. Becker,	Theo. P. Ebert,	M. F. Lauffer,	C. Schmidt,
J. L. Braun,	P. Engers,	C. F. Mayer,	H. A. Schmidt,
C. F. W. Brecht,	E. L. T. Engers,	E. Pfeiffer,	Prof. G. H. Schodde,
W. L. Busch,	A. H. Feldmann,	P. M. Reidenbach,	J. Stumpf,
J. G. Butz,	J. F. Gerkensmeyer,	H. L. Schenck,	A. W. Werder,
E. Cronenwett,	J. Hoerr,	B. F. Schillinger,	Otto v. Zech.
P. G. Doepken,	W. L. Kropp,	S. Schillinger,	

ENGLISH DISTRICT.

S. Baechler,	W. H. Brown,	J. O. Miller,	Prof.C. H.L. Schuette,
J. Beck,	C. H. Eckhardt,	O. S. Oglesby,	D. Simon,
H. A. Becker,	M. H. Hockmann,	A. Pflueger,	P. S. Swinehart,
A. Birch,	Prof. M. Loy,	H. J. Reimann,	M. Walter,
W. A. Bowman,	L. F. Meyer,	H. L. Ridenour,	G. Weber.

CONCORDIA DISTRICT.

L. H. Burry,	G. T. Cooperrider,	J. A. Lautenschlæger,	W. Sibert,
	E. G. Tressel,	E. L. S. Tressel.	

II. DELEGATES VOTING YES.

NORTHERN DISTRICT.

H. Meyer,	W. Jacobs,	C. Schwartzmann,	H. W. Kuttelbrink.
		J. L. Fehr, Teacher.	

WESTERN DISTRICT.

C. Robert, J. Gruebler, J. H. Spielmann, J. Deininger, H. F. Schnell. John Jung.

EASTERN DISTRICT.

Ph. Bock, Peter Schneider, J. Keck, Nic. Wendler, H. Stockert, George Schodde. G. W. Lose, W. Steinmann, Jos. Filges. Martin Wahl.

ENGLISH DISTRICT.

J. Binkley, J. Klein, M. L. Baum, Sam. A. Hahn. D. Snapp, jr. J. L. Trauger. Ph. Whonsettler.

CONCORDIA DISTRICT.

J. L. Hahn, J. Coiner,* J. Dasher, F. Stutz, G. F. Dannettel.
*Afterwards withdrew his vote.

B.—Those Voting Against the Substitute—No.

I. PASTORS.

NORTHERN DISTRICT.

E. A. Boehme, G. Dillmann, E. H. Scheips.

WESTERN DISTRICT.

G. Bachmann, W. L. Fischer, F. W. Franke, H. Henkel, C. J. Oehlschlaeger, J. D. Warns. F. Zagel,

EASTERN DISTRICT.

P. Brand, L. A. Detzer, C. Engelder, G. F. H. Meiser, P. Raether, K. Walz. F. Wilhelm, J. Wilhelm.

CONCORDIA DISTRICT.

F. Kuegele.

II. LAY DELEGATES.

EASTERN DISTRICT.

W Markensen, Peter Prager, H. Schaper.

Pastor J. C. Benzin of the Western District, refrained from voting, because he was not yet in the clear respecting the matter under discussion. The brethren B. F. Schillinger and J. M. Koepplin, whose names occur among those voting *Yes*, handed in an explanation to the effect, that they could vote for the substitute, with the understanding that we do not mean to say in

adopting the resolution that we accept every thing those theologians said and wrote respecting the doctrine of predestination; but that we thereby declare that we adopt the expression *intuitu fidei* in the sense in which it was understood by our orthodox dogmaticians.

It will thus be seen that 109 pastors and 33 lay delegates voted for the substitute, and 19 pastors and 3 delegates against it.

The following Protocol is from the Pen of Prof. Theo. Mees, as inserted into the Proceedings by the Regular Secretary.

Synod having thus almost unanimously declared its confessional standpoint as the only one authorized by the Lutheran Church in the Formula of Concord and since the completion of that confession, those who had deemed it necessary for them to vote *No*, now felt themselves constrained to set forth their position with reference to the declaration of Synod.

First of all Pastor P. Brand read a protest, signed by himself and other pastors, who had with him, voted in the negative; he also stated that he had not sought to get them to take such action and that he was acting in their name at their own request.

Following is the protest as translated and handed to the English secretary by Pastor F. Kuegele:

To the Venerable Joint Synod of Ohio and Adjacent States:

In its session of Saturday evening last synod, notwithstanding the protest of several members, passed the following resolution, in regard to which the undersigned find themselves bound in conscience to submit the following to the consideration of synod; the said resolution reading thus:

"OUR POSITION CONCERNING THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION.

We anew confess ourselves to the doctrine of election as it is contained in the Formula of Concord and also as in agreement therewith upon the whole it has been taught at all times by the Fathers of our Church; especially do we hold that doctrine as in agreement with the Scriptures and Symbols, and therefore as sound Lutheran, that the ordination of the elect unto eternal life took place in view of faith, i. e. in view of Christ's merits as apprehended by faith; therefore be it

Resolved, That as in the past so also in the future this doctrine, which we here again confess, shall solely and exclusively have any right in our Institutions, Schools, Publications, and Churches."

We hold that synod, by passing this resolution, has adopted a doctrinal

position which altogether changes the former confessional standpoint of synod, and against which we must protest for the following reasons:

1. Now as heretofore we, with all our heart, confess ourselves to the doctrine of election as the same according to the Word of God is explained, presented, and confessed in the Formula of Concord. But we cannot unite with synod in this new Confession, because united confession presupposes one-mindedness and unity of sentiment. Synod has declared that the Formula of Concord treats of election in the so-called widest sense. We hold this explanation to be false and a cause of perplexity.

2. In this resolution synod has declared, that our Church-Fathers upon the whole (we understand this as meaning the majority of the Fathers) had presented the doctrine of election in harmony with the Formula of Concord. We indeed concede, that the Fathers have preserved the true *foundation* of the doctrine as it is given in the Formula of Concord; nevertheless we are convinced, that some of the Fathers made use of expressions which are neither in accord with the Scriptures nor with the Symbols, and which should not be used without being explained. Furthermore we are convinced, that the Fathers have in some instances used different and contradictory expressions. We can therefore not confess ourselves upon the whole to the treatises of the Fathers, which have not even been named much less definitely described, because by such a confession a liberty of teaching is permitted which is against the word of the apostle: and because such a confession would imply, that all the members of synod had examined the said writings of the Fathers by the Scripture and the Confessions. See Book of Concord, Mueller's Ed., p. 573, § 3.

3. Synod declares that in particular that doctrine of some of the Fathers is in accord with the Scriptures and the Symbols, that election took place in view of faith, i. e. in foresight of Christ's merits as apprehended by faith. We declare that, although that manner of teaching is in itself not heretical, yet it is apt to lead to false doctrines. Now whereas in the pending controversy expressions have been used and explanations of the "intuitu fidei" have been given, which prove it to be a hazardous expression, unless explained according to the rule of faith, therefore we must reject an unlimited confession to the same. We must require of all those who make use of that expression to explain, whether they, together with us, confess, that man before his conversion, i. e. before his being made spiritually alive, can by his own natural powers neither prepare himself for grace in any way, e. g. refrain from wilful resistance, nor decide himself for grace in any grade of conversion nor in the continuance of conversion can co-operate therein in any way.

4. Finally, although synod did not directly pronounce the condemnation of the opposite doctrine, as the proposition originally was, we must nevertheless declare, that all right is denied the opposite doctrine, because the doctrine confessed in this resolution is henceforth solely to have any right in our Institutions, Schools, Publications, and Churches. We cannot permit ourselves to be thus bound in conscience to teach, that the Formula of Concord teaches an election in the widest sense. (We here refer to

declarations made before the vote was taken.) And also that election took place in view of faith, i. e. in foresight of Christ's merits as apprehended by faith. We have not bound ourselves nor can we permit ourselves to be bound to more than this: Not to deviate from our Confessions either in "Rebus" or in "Phrasibus." We consider this resolution of synod as un-Lutheran and oppressive of consciences.

Respectfully,

P. Brand, Pittsburgh, Pa.
H. Henkel, Logan, O.
F. W. Franke, Salamonia, Ind.
C. J. Oehlschlaeger, Pomeroy, O.
F. Zagel, Marysville, O.
F. Kuegele, Coiner's Store, Va.
Jacob Wilhelm, Carrick, Pa.
C. Engelder, Punxutawney, Pa.
G. Bachmann, Evansville, Ind.
D. J. Warns, Weltis, Ind.
F. Wilhelm, Denny, Pa.
E. H. Scheips, Stony Ridge, O.
Jacob Coiner.

After considerable time had been spent in discussion as to whether the above protest should be received or handed back to its authors, all motions relative thereto were laid on the table until synod had heard other protests that had been handed in. Hereupon Pastor G. F. H. Meiser read the following

DECLARATION.

The undersigned herewith states that he had to vote against the resolution adopted by synod on last Saturday evening,

(a) Not because he is unwilling to confess the doctrine of the Formula of Concord, for he heartily subscribes that as well as all the confessions of our church, as the pure and unadulterated explanation of Holy Scripture;

(b) Not because he considers the mode of teaching employed by the old dogmaticians and embraced in the expression *intuitu fidei*, when understood in the way in which those dogmaticians used it, to be of an heretical and church-dividing character;

(c) Also not because he considers our theological Professors at Columbus to be false teachers, because they employ the *intuitu fidei* mode of teaching, inasmuch as he is personally convinced that they make use of this mode of teaching in the sense of the older dogmaticians and repudiate all synergism, but

(d) Because he does not consider the *intuiti fidei* mode of teaching of the fathers as being the best *tropus*, and

(e) Therefore does not wish to be obligated to use the same in his church and school.

If now this honorable body will permit the undersigned to teach in his

church and school after this manner, to-wit, that God has elected us "*unto faith*," his view of the doctrine being the following: "That God, after He had from eternity decreed the redemption of the human race and had likewise ordained the means through which this redemption should be appropriated by men, foresaw who among men would stubbornly resist and not permit themselves to be brought unto salvation, and that He elected those, in whom He could carry on His work, unto faith and with it unto all the gifts of His grace, and keeps them unto life eternal in spite of Satan, the world and the flesh,"—then he sees no reason for severing the fraternal bonds by which we have hitherto been united. If, however, this honorable body cannot tolerate this mode of teaching on the part of its members, then it would follow that the honorable body considers the *modus docendi* of the undersigned as of a church-dividing character and would have to refuse to hold fellowship with him. G. F. H. Meiser.

With the above the following agree.

W. L. Fischer, George Dillmann,
P. Raether, E. A. Boehme,
K. Walz.

To the Honorable Synod of Ohio and other States:

The debate last week strengthened me in my conviction that the two modes of teaching in reference to the doctrine of election, when untainted by Calvinistic blasphemy and unmixed with synergism, are truly Lutheran.

I am confident that the Faculty of our Synod will also in the future testify decidedly, both in writing and by word of mouth, against synergism. I therefore declare, as far as I am personally concerned, that the *tropus* chosen by the revered Faculty, "That God has elected those who are infallibly saved in view of the merits of Christ apprehended by faith," is not of a church-dividing character.

Now, personally, I hold to the *tropus*, "That God has elected those who are infallbly saved, in Christ, through, in and to faith," and reject all Calvinistic inferences.

In order, now, that I may be certain as to my future relation in and to the honorable Synod of Ohio and other States, I request an answer to the question:

Does the honorable Synod of Ohio and other States consider an adherence to the last-mentioned *tropus* to be of a church-dividing character?

Please answer Yes or No.

Respectfully, L. A. Detzer,
Pastor belonging to the Joint Synod of Ohio and other States.

Wheeling, W. Va., September 12, 1881.

With reference to these three papers it was resolved that a committee of five be appointed, consisting of Profs. Loy, Stellhorn, Schuette, and Schmid, and Pastor Trebel, to examine said papers and to report to synod respecting them.

The committee referred to, after having examined the documents handed to it, reported as follows:

The documents handed to your committee for examination to the end that we might report thereon, are

a) A protest, signed by Pastors Brand, Henkel, Franke, Oehlschlaeger, Zagel, Kuegele, Engelder, Bachmann, Warns, F. Wilhelm, J. Wilhelm, and Scheips, and Mr. Jacob Coiner, in reference to the doctrinal position of the honorable synod on the doctrine of election.

b) A declaration, signed by Pastors Meiser, Fischer, Dillmann, Walz, and Boehme, also in reference to the doctrine of election.

c) A question from Pastor Detzer on the same subject.

Your committee take the liberty of making the following declaration respecting these documents:

I. With reference to the protest under point "a" we declare

1. That the charge made against our synod by the persons entering the protest, to the effect that in declaring her position on the doctrine of election she has taken a position which entirely changes the confessional standpoint she has heretofore occupied, if by this it is meant to say that this doctrinal position is something esseptially new,—is a defamation of our synod.

2. That when we say that the Formula of Concord speaks of election in the wider or, as can also be said, in the widest sense, we make this distinction according to the example of our church fathers, such as Koenig, Quenstedt, and Hollaz. We herewith direct attention to the declaration of Koenig as contained in the Minutes, with which the explanation of Quenstedt fully agrees.

3. When we say that our church fathers, *on the whole*, treated of the doctrine of election in harmony with the Formula of Concord, we understand thereby what the protesters, if we rightly apprehend their meaning, call "*the true ground of the doctrine*, namely, *the very substance of the doctrine of predestination*, to which, as the resolution of synod emphatically declares, that also belongs which we designate by the expression, "God has elected in view of faith." And whilst we admit that in this or that subordinate point one or another of the Fathers may use a different mode of expression, we still cannot concede that the Fathers, as the protesters plainly intimate, did not speak correctly and accordingly taught erroneously concerning the *doctrine* of election *itself*.

4. Over against the assertion that *only some of the Fathers* taught the doctrine that "God elected in view of faith, we call attention to the fact that, so far as we know, all the dogmaticians of our church, since the adoption of the Formula of Concord, made use of said expression in setting forth the doctrine of election.

5. We consider the assertion that the expression, "God elected in view of faith," easily leads to false doctrine, as unfounded, because it is taught in connection with said expression that *faith is itself* a work and gift of God who elects. On the other hand, we consider *that* doctrine according

to which election is said to have taken place without reference to faith, to be a very dangerous doctrine, easily leading to false doctrine, and one that can, to say the least, be very readily misunderstood.

6. In reference to the charge that synod demands an absolute confessional adherence to the expression, "God elected in view of faith," attention must be called to the frequent and oft repeated declaration of the honorable synod, that she wants this expression to be understood and used *only* in the same sense in which our Fathers always used it.

7. In regard to the questions and demands addressed to synod under No. 3 of the Protest, we believe that, after such explanations and discussions respecting this doctrine as have been thus far listened to, there is no ground for asking such questions, involving, as they do, an insinuation that synod is not orthodox. In respect to the individual expressions contained in these questions a lengthy explanation would be required, inasmuch as they can be understood in various ways, and as a matter of course synod has no time to give such an explanation. But if any one means to say that God irresistibly brings certain predestinated persons into heaven and grants them everlasting life, we reject his opinion as a Calvinistic heresy.

8. Respecting what is said in the 4th point of the *Protest* we declare that, as a Lutheran Synod, we accept the Formula of Concord as the church has always accepted and understood it, namely in this sense, that the doctrine, "That the election of persons took place in view of faith," is in accord with that Confession and is therefore truly Lutheran. He, now, who really occupies a *doctrinal position* in opposition to ours, can of course not remain with us without being a unionist.

II. In reference to the *Declaration* referred to under point "b" your committee take leave to declare: 1. That we do not approve of the expression, "God has elected unto faith," when considered in and of itself and without proper and correct explanation, because the same can easily be used in a wrong sense, and is so used at the present time. But as the same is used with limitations in the Declaration under consideration (namely that God, on the basis of the redemption and of the means of grace ordained for all and intended to be offered to all, foresaw from eternity who would obstinately resist and not permit themselves to be brought unto salvation, and elected, etc., those in whom He *could* carry on His work, unto faith, etc.,) we cannot reject it as false.

2. That we heartily rejoice in being able to say, in consideration of such a limitation in the use of said expression, that the doctrinal position of the brethren who signed the Declaration is in entire accord with the resolution of synod and that therefore they both could and should have voted Yes with us.

III. With reference to the question referred to under "c," as to whether the honorable synod considers the expression, "God has elected in Christ through, in and unto faith," to be of a church-dividing character, our answer is No, provided the meaning of it is not such a selection of persons according to which God *unconditionally* elected a certain few in preference to others *unto* faith:

In conclusion we desire once again to state that, as a matter of course, those who consider our doctrine to be false, and even in any way whatever characterize and combat it as such, cannot be and remain members of our synod. Respectfully your committee,

M. Loy, F. W. Stellhorn,
C. H. L. Schuette, E. Schmid.
G. H. Trebel,

After this report had been taken up for consideration, the 8 points in reference to the Protest signed by Pastor Brand and others, were adopted in the form in which they were presented by the committee. Pastor Brand was permitted to insert in the 3d point of the Protest the following words, which had been omitted in copying it: "or in any way to co-operate through the grace and strength which God bestows."

In like manner the portion of the committee's report referring to the "*Declaration*," signed by Pastor Meiser and others, was adopted, Pastor Meiser at the same time stating that we are agreed as to *foresight*, to-wit, that God also foresaw who would permit themselves to be brought to Him, and *then* decreed to bring them unto faith. After this the remainder of the report was also adopted.

Hereupon Pastor Brand read a final declaration in reference to his future relation to synod, with the request that the same be incorporated in the minutes. But synod declined to do the latter on account of the fact that it was impossible to reply to his declaration for want of time, and directed him to bring it before his district synod.

It was now

Resolved, That we invite those brethren who are not yet fully satisfied with the explanation given by synod, to a conference with our Theological Faculty, at such time and place as may be agreed upon by both parties.

The first item in the series of resolutions lying before synod was now taken up for consideration. It reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Joint Synod of Ohio and other States, much as it regrets the matter, herewith separates itself from the Synodical Conference of North America, because the honorable Synod of Missouri, which, as is known, represents the great majorjty of the Synodical Conference, has

1. Set forth and definitely adopted (last May) a doctrine concerning election which we cannot accept; and

2. Has definitely declared that it cannot confer with the majority of the delegates our districts have elected this year, because they have felt it to be their duty publicly to declare that the above-mentioned doctrine is Calvinizing.

In explaining why we could not vote for this resolution it was remarked that if the position of the Missouri Synod on this doctrine found expression in the 13 Theses that were published in the *Lutheraner*, we would have no scruples in subscribing the same according to their letter, but that we cannot subscribe to all that has been given in explanation of said Theses in the publications of the Missouri Synod.

In opposition to this it was maintained that when, as in the present doctrinal controversy, definite Theses have been drawn up, all that is written must be interpreted according to the Theses and not *vice versa*. But the Missouri Synod, it was urged, had herself declared that the 13 Theses are a summary of all that is written in her publications on this doctrine. This, however, was denied by the other side as not being in accord with the facts in the case, and a statement was made that proof for this assertion could be furnished.

In the second place, we have been told that the persons whom our synod has elected as delegates will not be recognized; in spite of this we have appointed them as delegates. Now, in order to act consistently the Missouri Synod dare not recognize these delegates, or she must reprove those by whom they were elected. In view of the resolution that our synod has passed, it would be useless for us to send delegates. Through that resolution we plainly confess the doctrine as our theological Faculty has thus far taught; we therefore subscribe to the doctrinal position of our delegates, and in this very fact Missouri will find a reason for bringing about a division. For this cause some spoke in favor of the first part of the resolution without any further assigning of reasons.

On the other hand some urged as a reason for erasing the whole of the first point the fact that the Missouri Synod does not constitute the Synodical Conference; other synods also belong to it, with reference to which we have the same duties to perform. Why then should our delegates not attend the meeting? If they can defend their doctrine, then they shall go and defend it. On both sides expressions have been used which admit of a false construction, and especially could they be falsely construed by those who had suspicion in their hearts. Missouri no more wants to teach Calvinism than we want to teach synergism. Where then could a confession that cannot be misunder-

stood better be witnessed than there? Colloquiums have always accomplished more good than the pen in such controversies. If the Missouri Synod wants to have nothing to do with us after both sides have set forth their convictions, well—then let the division come.

In reply to this it was stated that we certainly do not wish to have it appear even as though we sought a division; but many things have occurred which go to show that nothing but offense and confusion would come of our attendance at the meeting. Missouri will immediately protest against the admission of our delegates; at best they will receive a hearing, but will not be recognized either as voting or as advisory members—and that we will not do, for such a purpose we will not go. Missouri has the majority by means of which it can control the Synodical Conference, and accomplish what it pleases. Of course, the reasons for the resolution could be more strongly worded. For if a synod can declare, no matter what its *positive* standpoint may be, that it condemns our doctrine "to the utmost abyss of hell," we then can have no more to do with it. The reasons assigned should, of course, be given in a stronger and more exact form.

Against this the advice was again given that we should send delegates at any rate, in order to deprive Missouri of the chance to triumph over the alleged fact that *we* brought on the split. Missouri in fact commenced the division, let it also finish it.

In answer to this it was remarked that nothing will be gained by delay, but we will injure ourselves. The difficulty will soon arise as to what is to be done with congregations that have separated themselves from Missouri or have been expelled by it on account of their position on the doctrine of predestination. We would have to refuse to receive them, and they would perhaps have to stand alone and isolated for years between the two synods. If in the course of time another spirit should reveal itself the union can again, if desired, be restored.

In reference to the remark made concerning the condemnatory declaration of Missouri, it was said that if the expression had really been made even by one member of the Missouri Synod: "We condemn the doctrine of the *Ohio Synod* into the lowest pit of hell," we would admit that we have a reason for being no longer able to confer with that synod. But we (the speaker and others)

are firmly convinced that that expression is of a different character, as is evident from the testimony of eye-witnesses. The intention was simply to condemn all *false* doctrine, no matter where it is found. Likewise in regard to the 13 Theses the resolution in the minutes of the Delegate-Synod held at Ft. Wayne, page 41, confirms the statement that they set forth the doctrine of the Missouri Synod, understood as they sound, and that all else that has been written respecting that doctrine must be judged according to them.

It was stated that we are reluctant to take upon ourselves the responsibility of having helped to cause the rupture; but we consider the severance of our union with Missouri, yea the dissolution of the whole body of the Synodical Conference, as being already accomplished in fact. Under the present circumstances Missouri cannot confer with our delegates at all. Of course we now regard the dissolution of our union with the Synodical Conference as being more conducive to peace and as more beneficial in carrying on our own work, in order that we may not be hindered by outside influences.

But is the sending of delegates, it was asked, such a dangerous thing? If it is feared that they are not equal to the task assigned them, let us send others. Our connection with the Synodical Conference is of such a character that we dare not sever it by force. Let us then let this matter rest as it is for another year. If the Synodical Conference—*not the Missouri Synod*, which constitutes only one member of the Synodical Conference—tells us, "We do not want you," then we will go. *We* have brought charges against the Missouri Synod on account of its doctrine, and we are fully assured that we can sustain our charges. We will demand of *them* that they give an account of their doctrine and explain certain points thereof; if they are unable to vindicate their doctrine they can bear the consequences. The cry, "Synergists, Synergists," does not disturb us. We have stated the position of the Ohio Synod; whoever *will* not stand with us hinders our work. Let us therefore send delegates to the Synodical Conference on account of the brethren in it with whom we are united; for we have the same responsibilities resting upon us with reference to the Wisconsin and Norwegian Synods as with reference to the Missouri Synod. In fine, with Missouri we cannot labor together in a profitable manner; but

at the meeting of the Synodical Conference they must give account of certain expressions, so that we may not be obliged to regard them as false teachers, and in order that, as was the case in times past, the abomination of having opposition altars may not occur and the peace and successful existence of our congregations may not be jeopardized.

But with whom, it was said, shall we confer at Chicago? With reference to us the declaration will immediately be made: "We will not confer with these." When such a declaration has been made the Wisconsin delegates, in accordance with their instructions, will withdraw, as will also those from Minnesota. Only the few delegates of the Norwegian Synod will then remain, so to speak, as judges. Of course, we could then remain there, but would have no manner of authority and right. How could we then confer with any one respecting doctrine? We have valid proof for it that, before the vote was taken on the 13 Theses, Dr. Walther declared that whoever voted for those Theses also subscribed to the doctrine of an election *to* faith as it has been set forth in the writings of the Missouri Synod.

In opposition to this it was remarked: "We gladly concur with the above-mentioned motion to send delegates to the Synodical Conference, in order that we may bring it about that one party cannot make the charge of Calvinism nor the other that of Synergism; for then we can live in peace. Certainly none of us thinks that our delegates would be acting according to the meaning of synod, if they were to make the charge of Calvinism in this or that point against the Missouri Synod at the meeting of the Synodical Conference. The sense of the declaration of Missouri is simply this, that it cannot confer in peace with those who have publicly charged it with Calvinism, before they have explained what they mean.

Hereupon the following was offered as a substitute for the first point in the resolutions:

Resolved, That we send delegates to the Synodical Conference this year also,

(a) In order to do our duty in respect to that honorable body;

(b) Further in order to bring about, if possible—seeing that the confidence between our synod and another belonging to the Synodical Conference, namely, the Synod of Missouri, has been so shaken by the present unfortunate doctrinal controversy that the two synods cannot expect to labor together successfully in the near future—a peaceful dissolution of the

Synodical Conference as now existing, so that the different synods belongin to the Synodical Conference may hereafter, regarding each other as orthodox, not erect altar against altar and from now on exist side by side, but not in opposition to each other.

The mover of this resolution gave as his reason for handing it in that we are told to "give place unto wrath," that is, to let the passions first subside. We are also responsible to other synods in the Synodical Conference, and by means of this resolution we intend to discharge our duty toward them. But especially should we prevent, if possible, a return of the sad condition of affairs that formerly obtained, when through the erection of altar against altar the life of our congregations was destroyed and strife and contention were disseminated. In reply to this it was stated that by the adoption of the substitute we would only be postponing the matter a month; the result will inevitably be the same; why then delay the decision? We would thereby also be doing wrong toward those congregations that will sever, or have already severed, their connection with Missouri on account of their confession and stand with us on the same confessional basis. Shall they be left in doubt and uncertainty, without being able to find refuge among us?

Some do not seem to know and take into consideration the relation between Missouri and Ohio congregations, as, for example, the action of the Baltimore Conference sets it forth. Missouri seems to be intent upon severing the bond of brotherhood by force. We should certainly send delegates, but demand two things through them: first, a retraction of the new doctrine, and secondly, a taking back of the charge of Synergism. It is said that there are misunderstandings on both sides, despite the extended and plain explanations that have been given; we must still hear the old charges repeated. We must now not be desirous to conceal anything, but must make a clean breast of the matter. One of the delegates to the Synodical Conference having said that he would, on no condition, go to Chicago, the question was asked: Why are some so desirous, without further ado, to withdraw? Individual members of our synod have borne testimony against the doctrine of the Missouri Synod, and certain members of that synod have testified against us. Would it therefore not be according to order, if nothing else can be done, at least to dissolve the union in an *orderly* way? Why, according to the resolution now before us, we are bound

to dissolve this union next October; peacefully, if we can, and if we cannot do it peacefully to dissolve it at any rate. But we must do our duty, and avoid giving offense, if possible. Withdraw we shall and must—this all admit—but in an orderly way. The resolution is to the effect that we withdraw from the Synodical Conference, but once more send delegates.

But we must consider, it was said in reply, that it would be pleasant if we could go to Chicago and discuss the matter in a friendly way; we could then at least entertain the hope that we could labor peacefully side by side. But we cannot confer with Missouri according to its own declaration; hence a brotherly discussion and explanation is not possible. At best the Synodical Conference, especially the Missouri Synod, might examine us in respect to our orthodoxy; but, as a matter of course, we would not submit to such a thing as representatives of our synod. To send delegates to the Synodical Conference under the present circumstances would be a purposeless affair—a sheer wasting of time and money.

After this matter had been still further discussed the substitute was laid on the table, and the original resolution, after it had been divided into three parts, was adopted part by part, and then as a whole.

Against this withdrawal of the Ohio Synod from the Synodical Conference the following declaration was laid before synod by several brethren:

DECLARATION.

The undersigned herewith announce to this honorable body that the reason why they voted against the point in the series of resolutions which states that this honorable body herewith withdraws from the Synodical Conference, because the honorable synod of Missouri teaches a doctrine concerning election which this honorable synod cannot accept, is this, to wit: a) Although the undersigned cannot deny that expressions occur in the publications of the honorable synod of Missouri to which the undersigned cannot subscribe, inasmuch as those expressions left the impression that Calvinistic tendencies had crept into the doctrinal system of the honorable synod of Missouri—nevertheless

b) The undersigned cannot say that in the Confession of the Missouri Synod as a synod, which she has set forth and adopted in the famous 13 Theses, there is any leaven of false doctrine; and therefore they could not, for *this* reason, withdraw from the Synodical Conference.

D. J. Warns, G. F. H. Meiser,
P. Raether, P. Brand,

F. Wilhelm, G. Dillmann,
L. A. Detzer, K. Walz,
C. Engelder, W. L. Fischer,
F. W. Franke, H. Henkel,
E. A. Borhme, J. M. Koepplin,
E. H. Scheips, F. Kuegele.
G. Bachmann,

Synod resolved to lay this declaration on the table for the present.

The following substitute was offered for the second point in the series of resolutions:

Resolved, That we tolerate those brethren who do not accept the position we have now taken, as long as they do not publicly oppose us.

This substitute, however, was rejected, and the second point in the original resolutions was stricken out.

Business Transactions.

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE.

To the Hon. Body—The Joint Synod:

Your committee, to whom was referred the President's Report, respectfully recommend the following action with reference to the same:

1. Together with the President of synod, we express our regret at the necessity which has occasioned the present extra convention of Joint Synod.

2. With reference to the item in the President's report which calls attention to the present state of affairs in the Missouri Synod, and the possibility in view of the same, that Missouri pastors and congregations may make application to us for admission,

Resolved, That in this case the same principles must obtain which are observed in the reception of pastors and congregations in general, to wit: That their reception is a matter belonging to the several Districts; and that they must be one with us in faith and practice, and come to us in an orderly way.

3. Concerning the item asking the pleasure of synod in reference to the sending of delegates to the Synodical Conference, *Resolved*, That, since we are still in connection with the Synodical Conference, our delegates, also this year, shall attend its sessions; and that we leave the interpretation of *the resolution of the Missouri Synod in this matter* to the future action of the latter body, or its delegates.

4. Concerning the Periodicals of Joint Synod, *Resolved*, That the offer to make the *Columbus Bi-Monthly Theological Magazine* an organ of synod be accepted, and that a German bi-monthly Magazine also be established, the

two Magazines being issued in alternate months. Further, that the Faculty at Columbus shall have charge of and edit all the publications of synod, the *Child's Paper* excepted, dividing the work as they may deem best.

5. Concerning the item referring to the appointment of an agent to labor in the interest of our Institutions and of synod generally, *Resolved*, That the Board of Trustees of our Institutions appoint such an agent, as soon as they find a suitable man for the position.

6. With reference to the item referring to the establishment of a teachers' seminary, or normal school, your committee ask synod to decide, whether it will for the present be satisfied with the private enterprise in Woodville, O., or establish a school under its own auspices at Columbus.

In conclusion, *Resolved*, That the thanks of synod are due the President for the faithfulness with which he has discharged his responsible office, and that his report be incorporated in the Minutes.

Respectfully submitted,

G. F. H. Meiser, E. L. S. Tressel,
H. Lang, C. H. L. Schuette,
H. J. Schuh, F. Stutz.
J. H. Spielmann,

This report was received for consideration. The first and second items were adopted, whilst the third was erased. The fourth and fifth items were also adopted. In connection with the fourth item it was *Resolved*, That the thanks of synod be tendered to the editor of the *Columbus Theological Magazine* for the great service he has done our synod in establishing that periodical. The sixth item, referring to the normal school at Woodville, O., was handed back to the committee with the request that it confer with the brethren in and near Woodville for the purpose of drawing up definite proposals respecting this matter. The committee, in compliance with synod's request, then offered the following:

1. *Resolved*, That in view of the great lack of time properly to consider this matter at the present meeting of synod, the brethren who have established the private teachers' institute at Woodville, O., be requested to continue to same as a private enterprise until the next meeting of Joint Synod, at which time further action may be had in the matter by Joint Synod.

2. *Resolved also*, That we heartily commend this worthy effort of the brethren at Woodville, and earnestly request the congregations within the bounds of Joint Synod to encourage and support the same pecuniarily.

These resolutions were adopted. Hereupon the report was adopted as a whole.

REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE.

Your committee have in hand a number of papers containing excuses and coming partly from pastors and partly from congregations. Following are the pastors: J. M. Johanssen, G. Baughman, F. Schiedt, A. Eberbach, J. Dornbirer, C. Althoff, H. J. G. Bartholomew, A. S. Bartholomew, L. Vogelsang, A. Hordorf, F. H. Besel, A. Wendt, H. Borchers, W. F. Helle, F. A. Groth, G. E. Buchholz, C. Adam, H. Willert, D. M. Martens, and C. Franke.—Inasmuch as some of these pastors are sick themselves, some have sickness in their families and the rest have other urgent excuses to to offer, your committee move that they all be excused.

The following congregations ask to be excused:

The Ev. Luth. St. John's congregation, Lawrenceburgh, Ind.
" St. John's congregation, Wood Co., O.
" St. John's congregation, Hubbard, O.
" St. Immanuel's congregation, Mercer Co., O.
" St. Immanuel's congregation, Monroe, Mich.
" St. Paul's congregation, Dayton, O.
" St. John's congregation, Richmond, Ind.
" Zion's congregation, Tyrone, Pa.
" Parish at Bellville, O.
" Trinity congregation, Meadville, Pa.
" Zion's congregation, Springfield, O.
" Parish at Union City, O.
" St. John's congregation, Covington, O.
" Parish at St. Marys, O.
" St. Paul's congregation, Millersburg, Pa.
" St. Martin's congregation, Youngstown, O.
" St. Peter's congregation, Trenton, O.
" St. Mark's congregation, Baltimore, Md.
" St. John's congregation, Steubenville, O.
" St. John's congregation, Wapakoneta, O.
" St. Paul's congregation, Maybee, Mich.
" Parish in Clarion Co., Pa.
" Trinity congregation, Jackson, Mich.

The excuse offered by these congregations is their great distance from the place where synod is holding its meeting and the consequent expense of sending a delegate. Your committee move that said congregations be excused for not sending delegates.

The following pastors and lay delegates asked to be excused before the close of synod: F. Wilhelm (official business), S. Poppen (sickness), J. G. Butz (official business), A. H. Feldmann, J. Kucher, G. F. Reitz, F. N. Wolf, A. H. Weber (official business), E. Cronenwett (sickness); delegates S. Schwartzmann and S. Hahn.

Your committee request the honorable synod to excuse these brethren also.

Very respectfully, Your Committee,

G. Cronenwett, G. Loewenstein.
C. F. W. Brecht,

This report was received and adopted.

REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE.

To your committee has been submitted on the part of this synod a communication to which is affixed the signature of the Secretary of the Eastern District, from which communication it appears that this District submits to the Joint Synod, first, a report of Pastor Otto v. Zech, regarding a visit to Parkersburg, W. Va., made by himself in the interest of missions, and, secondly, a committee report referring to this matter. Both reports are in the hands of your committee.

Inasmuch as the Joint Synod has hitherto taken no action in regard to mission work, your committee takes the liberty to recommend, that the President of the Eastern District be herewith authorized, to make application to the Missionary Board of the Western District in behalf of this matter, since, in the opinion of your committee the missionary field in question, viz. Parkersburg and vicinity, is in the territory of the Western District.

Another communication in our hands is a communication from the St. John's congregation in Lawrenceburg, Ind., from which it appears that this congregation embraces some 20 families, but that after all the support that it has hitherto received, it is yet burdened with a debt of $4000. Your committee takes the liberty to propose, that this synod recommend this congregation to the favor and support of all its pastors and congregations.

Respectfully submitted, Your Committee,

G. Doepken, H. A. Becker,
Jacob Keck, Chr. Robert.

This report was received for consideration. The following was adopted as a substitute for the first item:

Resolved, That this matter be referred back to the Eastern District with the understanding that the congregations of Joint Synod, as a whole, take an active interest in the undertaking.

The second item, and with it the whole report, was then adopted.

Miscellaneous Business.

1. Synod was notified of the fact that our Liturgies are out of print and that it is therefore plainly necessary to make arrangements for a new edition. It was therefore resolved that we take into consideration the publication of a German and an English Liturgy. After the necessity for such an undertaking

had been succinctly set forth and some discussion had taken place as to the best way in which to proceed, it was

Resolved, That two committees, each consisting of two members, be appointed, respectively to prepare drafts of a German and an English Liturgy.

In reference to this it was *Resolved*, 1. That whatever changes and additions may be made are to be printed and sent to the pastors of synod; 2. That the forms for divine service as contained in our present Liturgies remain unchanged; 3. That the drafts thus completed be laid before the next meeting of synod for final action; 4. That Pastors J. A. Schulze, H. J. Schuh and E. L. S. Tressel act as a committee to nominate suitable persons, as resolved above, for the committees on Liturgies. This committee nominated Pastors Trebel and Werder as well as Pastors H. A. Becker and Mr. John Spielmann. These nominations were endorsed by synod.

2. In reference to our Book Concern it was

Resolved, That the congregations within the bounds of Joint Synod be earnestly requested to hold a collection for the Book Concern at Columbus.

3. In answer to the question: To which of the foreign missions shall we send the money collected for foreign missions? it was

Resolved, That such money shall remain in the hands of the Treasurer until the next meeting of synod.

4. *Resolved*, That 2500 German and 1000 English copies of this year's minutes be printed.

5. *Resolved*, That the thanks of synod be extended to the members of the St. James' congregation and to their pastor, Rev. A. W. Werder, for their hospitality during our stay in their city.

6. *Resolved*, That we thank the papers of this city for publishing reports of our proceedings, and that we also thank the Railroad companies for reducing the rates on their respective roads for the accommodation of the members of synod.

Thus was closed one of the most important conventions that the Joint Synod of Ohio and other States has ever held. God grant that the discussions, transactions and resolutions of this memorable meeting, which was opened, conducted and closed in His name and to His glory, may have His everlasting blessing resting upon them, so that they may bear rich and glorious fruits both in time and in eternity.

Lord Jesus Christ, Thy power display,
Establish o'er the world Thy sway;

Defend Thy church, who to Thy praise
Shall high the song of triumph raise.

O Holy Ghost, descend we pray,
Thy sanctifying power display,
Thy church console, our hearts unite,
And guide us to the realms of light. Amen.

A. PFUEGER,
English Secretary.

Divine Services held during the meeting of Synod.

On Wednesday evening, September 7th, Pastor G. F. H. Meiser preached on Matt. 22, 14.

On Thursday evening Pastor H. J. Schuh preached on Jer. 48, 10a.

On Saturday evening Pastor J. M. Koepplin preached a confessional sermon on Ps. 119, 25.

On Sunday morning Prof. E. Schmid preached on the Gospel for the day (13th p. Tim.) Luke 10, 23–39, whereupon the synod, together with the congregation, celebrated the Holy Communion.

On Sunday evening Pastor A. Pflueger preached in English on Rev. 3, 7–13.

On Monday evening Pastor F. N. Wolf delivered the closing sermon on 1 Cor. 15, 58.

A Brief Explanation

of the Position Taken by the Joint Synod of Ohio in the Present Controversy on the Doctrine of Election.

"Ye want war; war ye shall have!" So it is and so it must be; for mighty in Israel is he who so declares it. Accordingly, and as a matter of course, all brotherly fellowship with us was at once renounced. Peace and good will gave place to enmity and strife; and now war, a war of brethren with brethren, with all its attending evils, is upon us. And did we and do we really want this war, as stated? To this question we answer yea, and nay! For if we cannot abide by the truth of God's Word and the Confessions of our Church, and if we cannot secure ourselves and our fellow men against the invasion of doctrines strange and false except by way of war, then we want war at any cost. And a war, for reasons such as these, is now forced upon us. We are called upon now to fight the good fight of faith not only against enemies from without, but also from within our own beloved Church. In this our great distress, we need to be reminded of the duty of confession imposed upon us by the Word of God, as also of the comfort it promises to each and every one found faithful to the cause of holy truth. Just now we are called upon to give special heed to commands and promises such as these: If ye continue in my Word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free. John 8, 31. 32. Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. That good thing which was committed unto thee keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us. 2 Tim. 1, 13. 14. Finally, the admonition of Jude that we should earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints.

Mindful of these and similar words of our God, what will we

do in the present good fight of faith? Will we yield to the tempting voice of a false love of brethren and make peace where there can be no peace except at the expense of saving truth and by neglect of holy duty? God forbid! Nay, rather will we do our duty in the battle ordained us of God; and, doing our duty with the help of God, we will seek comfort in the wisdom and goodness of His ways, and seeking we shall not fail to find.

But now, which special truth are we to contend for just at this time? For unless we fight understandingly we need look for neither victory nor crown. An answer to this our question we find given in the following words of our synod:

We herewith confess anew the doctrine of election as it is contained in the Formula of Concord and also as it has in accordance therewith been always taught on the whole by the great teachers of our church; especially do we hold the doctrine of our fathers, that the ordination of the elect to eternal life took place in view of faith, i. e. in view of the merits of Christ appropriated by faith, to be in accord with the Scriptures and our Confessions; therefore

RESOLVED, *That in the future as in the past the doctrine here anew confessed, and none other, be authorized in our institutions, schools, publications and churches.*

What these words are intended to say and not to say we will now endeavor to set forth and explain as best we can.

In the first place it is stated that "*we herewith confess*

ANEW

the doctrine of election." Not a new doctrine is here subscribed and introduced; but we renew our confession to a doctrine which has had a place among us and which our synod has ever acknowledged as its own. Why then, it may be asked, have we just at this time renewed our confession of the doctrine in question? Has synod perhaps in time past denied the truth it once confessed? Has it departed from the faith it once inscribed upon its banner so that there is need of a return? No, not a sense of past faithlessness, rather a fear of present danger and fidelity to the truth has induced synod to renew its confession of the truth endangered. By the new controversy concerning the doctrine of election, every Lutheran is called upon to take a stand. He must decide whether he will abide by the old and true doctrine

of election as the Church has ever confessed it, or abandon it for a doctrine new and strange among Lutherans. To this question our synod makes answer as above stated, namely: We confess *anew* the old and true doctrine of election, the same doctrine we have thus far held fast. It is accordingly not true when it is said of us that up to our convention in Wheeling we have had no doctrine of election. Properly speaking, we have not there and then adopted a doctrine of election. For so doing there was no necessity whatever, since synod, by its subscription to the Formula of Concord years ago, made the doctrine of the Lutheran Church its own also on this point. No, synod by its action simply declares its position with reference to the controversy now carried on upon the subject of election. In regard to this it was resolved that *in the future as in the past* we will hold fast and defend the old doctrine. In other words, we want no new doctrine; and we take sides against those who attempt to introduce anything foreign to the truth as we have hitherto learned and confessed it.

And now, what is the doctrine we have thus far believed and taught, and which is to be taught among us in the future? The answer given, is: "*The doctrine of election*

AS IT IS CONTAINED IN THE FORMULA OF CONCORD."

There, in articles 11 both of the Epitome and its Exposition, you will find the *doctrine* of election which we have thus far confessed and intend to confess in the future. And, note well, we subscribe not merely the *doctrine* of the Formula, but also its *manner of presenting it.* We say, the *doctrine* there given is nothing but the pure and sound truth of God's Word. We further say, the *form of its presentation* is correct and in full accord with God's Word. This, and none other, was and is and is to remain the position of our synod. That such has been our doctrine we ascribe to God's gracious guidance; and His is all the praise. That we may so continue to believe and teach, He must enable us; and to do this we heartily beseech Him. And, sincere in its confession of this truth taught, and as taught by our Church, and deeply concerned about its preservation, synod demands of all its members that they acknowledge this doctrine as being none other than the doctrine of God's Word. It demands of them a confession devoid of all limitations and re-

servations. It further demands of all who would be members, a declaration that the Confession sets forth this doctrine in "the form of sound words." By so doing, every doctrine militating against the truth, whether in substance or form, is at once rejected and excluded. In short, we ourselves will not teach anything new, nor teach anything old in a manner new and strange, nor can we suffer others to do so among us. We intend simply to abide by the old, well approved and well tried Confession of our Church; and may God help us so to do.

But here the objection may be raised that, in the case before us, even an unreserved subscription to the Confession of the Church can be of no decisive meaning since the sense of the Confession itself constitutes the chief point of controversy and since both parties appeal to the Confession in support of the cause they espouse. Alas, that such objection is not without support. The Ev. Lutheran Church has indeed always believed that, since the adoption of the Formula of Concord three hundred years ago, she was in possession of the true doctrine of election; she has furthermore believed that she not only understood but also taught this doctrine of her Confession. But during the past few years the startling news is sent out from St. Louis, Mo., that the Lutheran Church is very much mistaken if she thinks that she understands her own Confession and accordingly teaches. They would make Lutherans believe that their church has, indeed, the pure doctrine in the Book of Concord, but that, during the past three centuries, she has neither correctly understood nor rightly taught the pure truth!? A sad picture this, if it were real. But thanks be to God, that there is no truth whatever in these presumptuous utterances. Nevertheless, this new Western idea is something whereof we are both ashamed and afraid. We are ashamed of it because men, otherwise of good repute in our church, have conceived it and seek its advancement. We have reason to fear it because it signifies a departure from the Confessions, and whither this will lead and what evils will attend it, God alone can know. Strange as it may seem, the Missourians would have us believe that this new departure is really a return to the doctrine of our Confession —*as Dr. Walther and they understand it, of course!!* Since they thus plainly tell us *in what sense they* subscribe to the doctrine of election as set forth in the Confession of the Church, it is incumbent

upon us to say *in what sense we* subscribe the article in question. Accordingly our synod says: *We herewith confess anew the doctrine of election as it is contained in the Formula of Concord and also as it has in accordance therewith been always taught on the whole by*

THE GREAT TEACHERS OF OUR CHURCH.

What do we mean to say by this? In the first place this, that, according to our conviction, it is simply not true that, as the Missourians say, our church and its great teachers during the past three hundred years neither properly understood nor rightly taught the eleventh Article of the Formula of Concord. In the second place, we mean to say that we consider the interpretation of the Confession as handed down to us by the Fathers, as the true and correct one; and that, in consequence, we hold the interpretation of the Missourians to be false and as such reject it. In the third place, we mean to say that we understand the doctrine of election set forth in the Confession as it was at all times understood by our fathers and our church, and that *we subscribe the eleventh Article in this churchly and historical sense.* Finally, we mean to say that although the teachers of our church have in part presented the doctrine of election *in words and terms* differing from those employed in the Formula of Concord, they nevertheless have not taught a doctrine contrary to the Confession and false, but *the same* doctrine. And inasmuch as their *doctrine* is none other than that of the Confession, we hold to them and make bold to confess their doctrine our own.

Persuaded as we are that the doctrine of election as comprehended in the Formula of Concord is in full accord with the teachings of Holy Scripture and that our own dogmaticians have taught

"IN ACCORDANCE THEREWITH,"

we do not at all hesitate to pronounce their doctrine in this respect our own. The wording of synod's "*position*" is such that it guards against even the possibility of endorsing anything contrary to the doctrine of the church. We confess the doctrine of election as taught by the fathers because it is, to the best of our knowledge, the same as is set forth in the Confession and the Scriptures. Should it be shown that such is not the case—and to do which all efforts have so far failed—the Joint Synod of

Ohio would still be confessing a doctrine none other than that of the Lutheran Church and the divine Word. For in her statement she subscribes a doctrine of the fathers, *not as opposed to, but in accordance with*, the church's symbol. And supposing the case that there be found a dogmatician, or that there be found in the writings of some of the teachers of our church an expression here and there, not in full accord with the doctrine of election as taught in the Confession, what then? Why even then synod will not have denied the truth or in the least departed from the faith of the church. We say, not that we subscribe to each and everything that each and every teacher of our church may have written on predestination; we say distinctly that we accept the doctrine as "*always taught*

ON THE WHOLE

by the great teachers of our church," and not as taught by *every* teacher and by every teacher in *every particular*.

From all this it is evidently a misinterpretation and a vain subterfuge when synod is made to say: "*You must obligate yourselves to teach the doctrines of men!*" What is meant when we say that we hold to Luther and confess Luther's doctrine, even the children of our church are expected to understand; and no doubt they can and do. But now when we, in our conviction that the teachers of our church have held fast and faithfully defended the pure doctrine of God's Word and our Confession concerning the eternal election of God, and accordingly pronounce their doctrine our own, the cry is raised even by very learned preachers: "*You desire to bind upon us doctrines of men—to this we will not submit!?*" When, on the other hand, these very men declare: "*We side with Walther—we confess Missouri's doctrine?*" such is *not* to be a confession of the doctrines of men! Reconcile actions such as these whoever can, we can not; and to judge is not our business.

But what mean the closing words of synod's "*Position?*" They read as follows: "*Especially do we hold the doctrine of our fathers, that the ordinalion of the elect to eternal life took place*

IN VIEW OF FAITH,

that is, in view of the merits of Christ appropriated by faith, to be in accord with the Scriptures and our Confessions.

In the first place and above all it is the *doctrine* and not the *expression* about which we are here concerned. And which is the doctrine our fathers chose to set forth when they employed the above phrase? *Not* this that faith is in any way man's own work; *not* this that faith, albeit that it is wholly the work and gift of God's grace, were to any extent a merit on account of which God could bestow salvation upon us. Our fathers entertained no such thoughts; they were far from teaching such heresy. They taught, as we now teach, that Christ alone with His precious merits has obtained for us everlasting salvation. They further taught, as we do now, that no one can enter the kingdom of heaven except he have first apprehended Christ and His merits. And just because no one can enter heaven without *having* Christ, our fathers could and would *not* teach—as did the Calvinists—that God elected from eternity unto life everlasting some people as being *without* Christ and as *lacking* His merits. If the question be asked: What moves God to elect any one unto eternal life? our fathers' answer is: Nothing whatever except God's own free mercy and Christ's precious merits. But if you inquire further: How does it come to pass that God elects some people and not others? our fathers would answer, and we likewise: *God foresaw in some the merits of Christ by faith; and on account of these merits, but not on account of the faith appropriating them, He elected those called the elect.* In others however he foresaw a persistent rejection of Christ's merits; and on account of this their pertinacious unbelief He elected them not. Such is, in a few words, the *doctrine* our fathers designed to express when they say that "God has elected us in view of faith." And so they taught in *opposition* to the abominable opinion of Calvinists, who maintain that God from eternity has ordained a certain few of mankind unto eternal salvation; and, in order to bring these few unto salvation, He has furthermore resolved to bring these few unto faith, whether or no, and in faith to preserve them, and them only, to the end of their lives. And now our synod declares that the *doctrine* our fathers have maintained over against this Calvinistic heresy, is in full accord with the teachings of the divine Word and of our Confessions; and in loyalty to both the Word and our Confession, synod joyfully and unequivocally made this teaching of the fathers its own. An emphatic rejection of all Calvinism is designed and an unmis-

takable confession of the pure Lutheran doctrine is intended, when we say with our fathers that God has elected us in foresight of faith. Such, and none other, is the meaning of the words under consideration.

It is *untrue*, however,—*and all present at synod know it to be untrue*—when it is asserted that synod would have its members bound to a use of the *expression*, "*in view of faith.*" Of this nothing whatever is said in the wording of the "position." Besides, the statement, that this was neither intended nor expressed, was repeatedly made on the floor of synod. That nothing of the kind was and is designed is also evident from the fact that, when some of the brethren declared that they could not approve the *expression* although they did accept and confess the *doctrine* it is meant to convey, not the least intimation was given that we would on this account refuse to acknowledge them as brethren. We are therefore constrained to pronounce it an inexcusable wrong done our synod by those who, fully aware of all these facts, yet raise the cry: "*They—the members of synod—would have us bound to the dogmaticians and their mode of teaching! This we will not submit to! Therefore away with synod as quickly as possible!*" *etc., etc.* And pray, why such haste? No doubt for the simple reason that the congregations might learn the facts in the case and in consequence decide *not* to leave but rather stay with synod and with it fight the good fight of faith.

In conclusion we have a few words to say in regard to the expression "*in view of faith.*" Ever since *Missouri* has spoken of it in terms of disapproval it is regarded with suspicion, also by others; for great is the authority of those who would have it condemned. Now, what must be said in favor of this term? 1. It was brought into use by a great theologian of the Lutheran Church. 2. It has, ever since its introduction, been in constant use within our church; so much is this the case that it may be found in almost every Lutheran book which at all treats of the doctrine of election. 3. Its *meaning* has been so well defined and is so throughly understood by Lutherans that they cannot abandon it without the appearance, at least, of surrendering a most precious doctrine of the church. 4. It has been employed against the godless doctrine of predestinarianism; and with such effect that Calvinists verily detest it. On the other hand, what can be said against its use? 1. It can possi-

bly be misunderstood. 2. The Missourians cannot bear it because *they cannot bear the doctrine* it is designed to convey. In view of these reasons for and against, if the latter can be called reasons, what will we do? Shall we also stigmatize the phrase as an unwise and misleading one and abandon its use? God forbid! No, we will continue to use it on account of the precious doctrine therein expressed. We will defend it in honor of the many fathers of our church who have used it, and on account of the excellent service it has rendered them in their warfare with error. We will use it and give prevalence to its real meaning on account of the many excellent Lutheran books wherein it occurs. And especially in the present controversy will we exalt it as our banner and wave it in the face of the enemies of pure Lutheran doctrine.

So doing we will, however, not quarrel with brethren who do not, for reasons of their own, view this matter as we do. All we ask of them is that they be *one* with us in *doctrine*. Never in the history of the Lutheran Church has she attempted to bind upon its members the approval and use of a particular manner of speech, of mere human expression, of forms, and the like. And, least of all, does the Joint Synod of Ohio wish to do anything of the kind. If, however, any one would want to reject with any *form* of doctrine the *doctrine itself*, the case is wholly different. Under such circumstances there is no longer unity of the spirit, and therefore all outward fellowship must end.

According to the position taken by synod, each one of its members is at *full liberty* to present the doctrine of election after the manner of the Formula of Concord or after the manner of our dogmaticians; but he must, apart from the manner *how* he teaches, teach nothing but the *one true doctrine of our Church*. This one true doctrine synod has confessed anew, and to teach this its every member is obligated — unto nothing more and nothing less. And thanks be to God that He has preserved us against a departure from the pure truth of His Word and our Confessions. May the light of His countenance shine and continue to shine upon us ever and ever! Amen!

C. H. L. S.